DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 533 EA 004 863

AUTHOR	Leeper, Robert R., Ed.
TITLE	A Man for Tomorrow's World.
INSTITUTION	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	91p.; Papers presented at Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Conference. (25th, San Francisco, California, March 14-18, 1970)
AVAILABLE FROM	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. (NEA Stock Number: 611-17838, $2.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Affective Behavior; Cultural Interrelationships; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Planning; Educational Accountability; Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; Ethnic Groups; *Futures; *Humanization; Open Education; Political Socialization; Relevance (Education); Self Actualization; Social Influences; Social Responsibility; Teacher Education; Western Civilization

ABSTRACT

The first part of this publication is given over to three major papers that emphasize the present and urge consideration of the problems and challenges of man's future. In "Education for Genuine Community," Samuel D. Proctor emphasizes the need to strive for a new momentum toward community as a possible solution to societal problems. Theodore Roszak, in "Educating Contra Naturam," argues for the conception and implementation of new understandings of the realities of the institution of organized education. Alexander Frazier reviews the quest of a generation of school people for an instructional program that might be conceived as adequate for "the grand curriculum" that is life itself, in "Here and Now: Points of Decision in the Quest for a New Curriculum." The second part of the publication consists of two papers adopted for study and action at the 1969 and 1970 ASCD conferences and which represent official statements of that organization -- "The Generation of New Understandings: a Program of Study and Action" and "The Quality of Life and Society in the United States." (Author/EA)

ED 072533

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A MAN FOR TOMORROW'S WORLD

Addresses by SAMUEL D. PROCTOR, THEODORE ROSZAK, and ALEXANDER FRAZIER

and
Two ASCD Position Papers

from the
25th Annual Conference
San Francisco, California
March 14-18, 1970

Edited by ROBERT R. LEEPER
Editor, ASCD Publications

EA 004 863

Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY RIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ASCD
NEA
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Copyright © 1970 by the
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Price: $2.25
NEA Stock Number: 611-17838

The materials printed herein are the expressions of the writers and not a statement of policy of the Association unless set by resolution.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 78-124096

Contents

Acknowledgments iv

Foreword v
John D. Greene

Part I. Addresses, 1970 ASCD Conference

Education for Genuine Community 3
Samuel D. Proctor

Educating *Contra Naturam* 12
Theodore Roszak

Here and Now: Points of Decision in the Quest for a New Curriculum 28
Alexander Frazier

Part II. Papers Adopted for Study and Action at the 1969 and 1970 ASCD Conferences

The Generation of New Understandings: A Program of Study and Action 47

The Quality of Life and Society in the United States 62
Alexander Frazier

Contributors 85

Acknowledgments

FINAL editing of the manuscript and publication of this booklet were the responsibility of Robert R. Leeper, Associate Secretary and Editor, ASCD Publications. Technical production was handled by Mary Albert O'Neill, Lana Pipes, Nancy Olson, and Karen T. Brakke. Cover and title page were designed by Robert J. McMeans, NEA Publications Division.

Foreword

AS SCHOOL people, we are very much concerned with "A Man for Tomorrow's World." This, of course, was the theme of the Twenty-fifth Annual Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, which met March 14-18, 1970, in San Francisco, California. All special groupings during the conference sought for new understanding of the age-old questions: What is man? What may he become? How can education assist in this understanding, this becoming?

As one reads the addresses and the papers presented in this booklet, he realizes that the seeds of tomorrow's world are planted in the soil of the turbulent present. The speeches and the writings seem to reinforce the words and the focus indicated by Alexander Frazier when he stated: "Perhaps we should read the theme *this* way: 'A Man for Tomorrow's World, Today.' "

This emphasis upon the present and upon the urgency for a consideration of the problems and the challenges in man's becoming was the unifying thread which bound together the rich and varied elements of this Silver Anniversary of the Association. In a very real sense, "Generating and Implementing New Understandings" has become the major focus of ASCD. The idea for such focus was conceived by the 1968-69 Executive Committee under the leadership of Muriel Crosby. This focus is evident and is reflected herein as one reads and studies the paper, "The Quality of Life and Society in the United States," and its companion paper, "The Generation of New Understandings: A Program of Study and Action." Realizing the importance of these generative ideas and the need for time to translate these concepts into practice in school and society, the 1969-70 Executive Committee under the presidency of Alexander Frazier continued to study, reanalyze, and implement new understandings through ASCD affiliated units, through regional and local groups. ASCD members throughout the nation cooperated in a "National Study Day," which was conducted on May 15, 1970.

Either directly or indirectly, each major presentation at the national conference reinforced the long-range ASCD focus on "Generating and Implementing New Understandings" and at the same time augmented the conference focus of "A Man for Tomorrow's World, Today." Samuel D. Proctor says:

> When the society starts falling apart it is understandable for us to focus our attention on education and expect its leaders to create a new momentum toward community. Of course, we recognize that when we turn to education we are turning to an institution that derives its existence from the very society that we want to heal. It is a product of the society and the umbilical cord cannot be cut. So, even though we have hardly any other agency for change with the potential of education, we recognize its limitations. It is a beholden thing!

As a possible solution to societal problems, Dr. Proctor emphasizes our need to strive for the creation of a sense of "genuine community." His ideas are more fully developed in his address, "Education for Genuine Community."

In "Educating *Contra Naturam*," Theodore Roszak draws heavily upon ideas which he has developed at greater length in his current best-selling volume, *The Making of a Counter Culture*. He encourages us to conceive and to implement new understandings of the realities of the institution of organized education when he challenges us by stating:

> We might begin talking up the natural rights of truancy and the educative possibilities of hooky. . . . Once we stop forcing *our* education on the children, perhaps they will invite a lucky few of us to participate in *theirs*."

Dr. Roszak refers to the Tolstoy model of the volunteer school for peasant youngsters as an ideal embodiment of schooling, realizing that "the people love and seek education, as they love and seek the air for breathing." We might, however, raise the following hypothesis: If we had as many techniques for teaching a child to talk as we have for teaching him to read, is it not possible that we would soon have as many non-talkers in our system as we have so-called non-readers?

Alexander Frazier reviews with scholarly insight the quest of a generation of school people for an instructional program in the schools that might be conceived as adequate for "the grand curriculum" that is life itself. In his presidential address, "Here and Now: Points of Decision in the Quest for a New Curriculum,"

Dr. Frazier synthesizes many educational thoughts and movements and places these in practical operational perspective for the benefit of his audience of persons in curriculum and educational work. He holds that the core of the new curriculum is humanization, with special emphasis on an awareness of the need for enhancing the quality of life and culture for the people of the United States and of the world. New commitments and new decisions confront all of us who are charged with developing and implementing "a new curriculum."

In his paper, "The Quality of Life and Society in the United States," Dr. Frazier discusses the need for reverence as a concern for meaning in human experience. He states:

> Possibly what we are undergoing is the result of trying to put together and reconcile in some ways the virtues or values of an emerging new culture, that will make room for immediacy, austerity, authenticity, openness, autonomy, and responsibility. What a task this proposes for man!

Our hope for the creation of a man worthy of tomorrow's world may well rest upon the further development and e[illegible]tment of the ideas that are projected into the two official pap[illegible]s which are included in this document and which are official position statements of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

JOHN D. GREENE, *President 1970-71*
Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development

PART I

Addresses, 1970 ASCD Conference



SAMUEL D. PROCTOR

Education for Genuine Community

IT IS a tough assignment to ask education to undertake the task of building a genuine sense of community in America. It is a task that needs urgent attention, but is education ready or able? We have completed our geographic community. We are spread from sea to shining sea. We are ringing our old cities with satellite communities and we are bold about building anything anywhere. Jet planes and television have us stumbling over each other and regional speech habits are less and less identifiable.

We see signs of the making of a national community, but genuine community means more than wearing the same clothes, eating the same food, singing the same songs, or using the same language. It is much more profound. It deals in attitudes toward the defenseless, the use or misuse of natural resources, how a stranger feels in our midst, and what hope there is for a late entrant in the race to success. A society may have physical community thrust upon it, but genuine community is a human achievement.

Moreover, the polarization in our country is hardening. The cynicism of many of the young is growing. The leadership from high government is ambiguous at best and fatalistic at worst.

The young who are so critical of our institutions have no mutual basis for conversation with adult leadership. For they have rejected the starting points of discussion that the adult generation takes for granted, namely: the Judeo-Christian ethical norms and free enterprise. They declare that our conduct has made such a mockery of ethics that we have lost credibility, and that the free enterprise system has failed to cure poverty or to keep an economy stable without a war every generation. So, on two very important counts the conversation ceases.

The black population is no longer content with a slow trickle of favored and talented ones in their midst escalating to positions of privilege while their masses are caught in a spiral of poverty, ignorance, and futility.

But even apart from the question of the generation gap and the racial gap, the country has a deeper chasm to bridge. We are divided between, on the one hand, those who feel that America is big enough, strong enough, and responsible enough to invest its resources on a generous scale to humanize life for her masses at home and to share far more freely her resources abroad and, on the other hand, those who are postured in the opposite direction. The latter believe that it is not the business of anyone to establish a floor on poverty and want. They cannot conceive of people in America not getting what they deserve. They have no awareness of social processes that compound injustice or of the unfair distribution of advantages. They see everything as earned and they are blind to their inherited status that may be a fortunate one, and that of another that may be unfortunate.

This condition did not suddenly descend upon us like a solar eclipse. We have been moving toward it for a long time. It is more visible today because those who have been estranged, alienated, and insulated have become more and more vocal. They will not become less vocal. Their aspirations will not recede. The forces are solid and real that have raised the expectations of the disinherited. They have made people aware of their tangential status in our society. And this awareness is no illusion.

We need help. We need to find out how to succeed in laying the foundation for building genuine community in America. This need is more important than faster trains, bigger planes, better surgery, cleaner water, and purer air. We could press our technology to a fine perfection, work out the rhythm of the economy, clean up the environment, and add years to our lives, but with this technology and in this sanitized environment we could stumble and blunder into one conflict after another until our only option left would be as barbarous as those of cavemen and as primitive as those of the anthropoids. We need help.

Attaining Genuine Community

The term "genuine community" is used to suggest that there are superficial levels of community that are fairly easily attainable. Men who are accidentally thrown together by the force of circum-

stance, with no choice on their part, share only physical proximity. This does not involve the height and depth of the human spirit. It calls for politeness and civility, but it does not call into motion the more profound aspects of our human capacities. Men who happen to share the same airport limousine from the loading ramp to the hotel lobby may be said to be in community. But this is for one hour and with a very limited objective. Athletes who take to the field, wearing the same uniform and prepared to risk injury for victory, are indeed in community. But again, this is for a limited time span and for a very limited objective.

Even families, sharing a common genetic and biological heritage, whose voices have a similar timbre, whose members walk with the same gait, and whose youth is spent by the same fireside, share a great deal in common. But unless they choose to live by a common set of values, unless their sense of charity exceeds their competing ambitions, and unless their blood kinship is superseded by a moral kinship, their community is strained and tenuous. Luckily, for some families, even though they inherited each other they do eventually choose the fellowship of each other and their family ties are interwoven with the strongest human ties, and community is created.

Genuine community has to do with a long time span. Its duration is limited by choice, not by other arbitrary constraints. It arises out of volition, not circumstance. It means that the freedom to deny fellowship is a real freedom and with this freedom men choose rapprochement rather than estrangement. This is genuine community. It involves us not at surface levels of concern alone; rather, in genuine community the total life is involved and every facet of the prism of human emotion is reflected from one side to another.

Genuine community may be difficult to describe, but its absence is easily recognizable. Everyone can tell when he is being tolerated. Everyone knows when solitude is better than false fellowship. Everyone knows when clear limits to his participation have been set and when most of his personhood is being denied.

The achievement of a genuine sense of community will not be easy. As John Gardner says, it is more fun to hate than to love. It seems to be so much easier to stand body deep in our own racial and economic circles with our backs turned to the world and sing our chauvinistic songs to one another.

Moreover, the culture is loaded with symbols that tell us who people are, and who should be in and who should be out, who

should be sponsored and who should be rejected. We have had so much experience, so much rehearsal in exclusion tactics that we would have an awful lot of reeducation to do to start building a strategy for inclusion. The advantaged groups and classes have the institutions of business and government so aligned in their favor that only the most discerning can tell where social grouping ends and institutional life begins. In other words those who are left out are locked out and those who are in are in to stay.

It is only natural and fair to turn to education for leadership in this difficult time because we have spent millions of dollars developing a system that carries a student from age 5 to age 20 without significant cost to himself or his parents. Our tradition strives for objectivity and for that truth which is born out of evidence. Furthermore, the system has a sort of unwritten commitment to distribute opportunity, to become the grand intervention in the life of a child whose social and economic legacy is weak.

So, when the society starts falling apart it is understandable for us to focus our attention on education and expect its leaders to create a new momentum toward community.

Of course, we recognize that when we turn to education we are turning to an institution that derives its existence from the very society that we want to heal. It is a product of the society and the umbilical cord cannot be cut. So, even though we have hardly any other agency for change with the potential of education, we recognize its limitations. It is a beholden thing!

Another limitation is that we have never been where genuine community would lead us. This would be a novel thing both in substance and in pursuit. We have had all sorts of goals for education, the growth of the whole child, academic excellence, citizenship participation, and global awareness, but our times call for an added dimension.

We want education to prepare us to live in a society of variety and make it work, to live among people with widely differing starting points and find joy in seeing them all moving forward at their optimum pace, to find happiness and fulfillment not in power—in domination—in self-destructive greed and materialism—but in helping others to find value in their lives. We want education to define a new goal for us that is more satisfying than affluence, more humane than race and class strife, and more decent than self-indulgence.

The accent in our society has been on competition and success, and this success was seen as a mark of personal supremacy. This

gets passed down through the system and education is just a series of scratch lines for one heat after another.

This process is designed to select winners and losers. So many emphases are placed on winning and losing that one great fear stalks us all and we are taught to be self-regarding for the sake of winning. This self-regard enlarges to group-regard, class-regard. Our positions are jealously guarded and instead of this fostering community it fosters strife, competition, and subtle forms of preferentialism.

The culture is geared up for non-community, rather than community. We are far better trained to compete, to succeed, and to prevail than we are to cooperate, to inspire, and to support.

If, then, the man for the new age must be a participant in genuine community, what is reasonable and fair to ask of education? Given the limitations that we have acknowledged and the rigidities with which we must reckon, what options are open to school personnel that would make some real differences, feasible options, and "do-able" options? What are some "for instances" that can be performed in human history and that do not require the heavens to divide and a new Jerusalem to descend?

The New Frontiers of Education

Well, we can surely give our students a new introduction to the human family by broadening the scope of the humanities. When I was a boy in school I was left to believe that Timbuktu was a mythical place on the edge of wonderland. In 1962 I greeted four Peace Corps volunteers who had driven from Monrovia to Lagos passing through Timbuktu! It shook me!

We can include in our presentation of man's search for the good, the beautiful, the true, and the ultimate some answers that were arrived at by the Asians, the Latin Americans, the Africans, and the dwellers of the islands of the seven seas. We need a more balanced diet for the young, nurturing the notion that modern man belongs to a total human community that stretches far beyond the Mediterranean and the Atlantic cultures.

Our present offerings, with a very few exceptions, imply the subtle suggestion that civilization began in 1066 and all that went before was a prelude to William the Conqueror. The rest of the world lay in a shadow of stupidity and barbarism with a slight interruption by Socrates, Aristotle, and Cicero. After all, there was quite a highly developed Moslem culture in pre-colonial Africa and the

pyramids were not built by idiots. Modern Japan does not rest on Western European antecedents and the idea of ethical monotheism does antedate Shakespeare by a few thousand years.

What do you suppose students think when a course is listed as "Non-Western Civilization"? It says that one should be prepared for a surprise! It is a very condescending view of people whose origins are other than European.

As technology gallops toward a shrinking world, bringing us all closer together, and as we suffer the consequences of ethnic and national isolation, the man for the new age must become acquainted with the human race in a positive and affirmative way in all of its variety.

It is true that the European continent may have been the extraordinary beneficiary of favorable climate and rainfall, a livable mean temperature, and a safe distance from the equator and the two poles. It is true that these factors invited Christianity, Egyptian mathematics, and Greek logic and language. It became the repository of three excellent cultural syntheses: Greek, Christian, and Roman. But this process needs to be made very clear and the existence of other cultures needs to be explained, too, in terms of their environments. One basis for community is this broad appreciation for all peoples doing their own thing with what they had.

As we turn to the social sciences the situation is not far different. The promise of August Comte that the social sciences in a positivistic framework would be neutral, objective, and unbiased has been lost to the cult of enumeration. The social sciences have been frightened into a safe discipline of counting things, describing events that have already happened, and cataloging social groups that have already formed. The most sophisticated social science will dare to chart the trajectory of a movement that somehow has already been launched.

It is altogether too risky to look at the possibilities that the future may hold when it is so professionally safe to recount again and again what the past has shown. Social science deals in memorabilia. Whoever it was who said that history is the only true social science was right in practice but dead wrong in theory.

If Arthur Schlesinger was correct when he said history has seen more change in the last hundred years than in the previous thousand, then we can slow down on retrospection and concentrate on prognostication! Where are we going so fast? Whose business is it to tell us?

It is not enough to know how Jefferson, Adams, and Monroe

put together our Constitutional democracy. We need to know how viable it is: how does it accommodate the power foci that have developed, how do we save it from economic manipulation, how do we protect its minorities, how does it save its citizens from a runaway technocracy, and how does it manage to share its prerogatives with the growing need for a world political community? The questions relate to the task of real community.

Moreover, if we are to prepare our young for genuine community they need to know more than how the American economy advanced so fast. They need to examine its capacity to care for its victims at home and abroad. How compatible is a competitive free enterprise system with world hunger, with the self-determination of small and powerless nations from whom so much of our raw material is extracted? These are the questions that have college students so up-tight, and the answers are slow.

It is beautiful to know how much of our freedom was explained away by Darwin, Marx, and Freud, but it would be even better to know how much is left! Should we be stranded believing that all that we can ever become is shaped already by class struggle, by natural selection, and by glandular necessities? Who is going to show us that margin of freedom that remains? Who is going to show us how to transcend class struggle, how to impose human direction upon natural selection, and how to sublimate glandular demands to the requirements of total self-realization? To what discipline do these questions belong? These are the truly big questions and the answers are the new frontiers of education and the prerequisites for genuine community.

The people in charge of the natural sciences and mathematics want to exempt themselves and tiptoe out of the room when we get to such softheaded topics as equalizing opportunity in education. They declare that there is no room for new entrances to their sacred chambers, and that the old exits are still there.

This is so critical because these are the bread and butter subjects. Here is where jobs are found, and if economic change is to come it will require as a prime condition that the employables should be at home in a world of cause and effect and be able to make accurate predictions. And real community will not go far beyond the stage of sentiment and romanticism if it does not embrace the notion that people who have been deprived can be prepared for economic self-sufficiency.

Nothing shows so clearly the way in which education fails to support genuine community as the way in which math and science

promote those who are ready and intimidate those who are not ready. This process galvanizes the job categories and guarantees a population of those who cannot keep pace with technology.

Man, the Incurable Adventurer

These disciplines are the turf for middle class students, black, white, red, brown, and yellow. They have had plane rides, they have been taken to the zoo to do more than giggle at strange sights, they know how a garden grows, why birds migrate, and what the Ice Age had to do with the Grand Canyon. They are not frightened by big words, Greek and Latin derivatives that turn up in biology and geometry. They have been taught to approach nature and numbers with an audacious questioning attitude. There are no mysteries too sacred to probe. But those whose parents are less verbal and whose work discourages reflective thinking cannot prepare their children adequately for science and mathematics, for the cycle goes round and round. Their children are squeezed out of the competitive job market.

Thus far, we are not talking about native intelligence. We are talking only about life style and the adequacy or inadequacy of preparation to leap into the sciences on the run.

The challenge therefore is to produce some teachers who will be patient enough, vicarious enough, humble enough, and compassionate enough to learn the world and the experiences of the economically deprived, learn that world well enough to walk around in it intellectually, and to discover how to use the jargon of that world, the thought coinage of that world, the experiences of that world as a starting point for making the secrets of nature lay themselves bare.

The importance of this can be seen as we contemplate the continuation of the present process, children from tenant farms and from the urban ghetto spending twelve years in school and finding college a house of mirrors. When education becomes for them an intriguing and exciting experience, they will stick with it. They will be ready for the best jobs, they will make the leap out of the poverty syndrome, and their children will have a different starting point in life. This is a basic condition to the building of genuine community in America.

We have seen education rise to majestic crescendos from time to time as the cadence of progress has called for a new and larger effort. There will always be those who will want to see the status

quo protected because of their own interests, but they forget that the status quo was once new; it had to be striven for; it was once a very novel thing.

So we are asking for novelty now, that the next generation may inherit a status quo different from ours and more nearly appropriate for the total man. It seems a long way off in view of today's newscasts and front pages.

But man is an incurable adventurer. The higher the mountain, the more eager he is to scale it. The wider and deeper the ocean, the more anxious he is to span it. The farther away the planet, the more he dreams of circling it. The more dreadful the disease, the more determined he is to conquer it. The more complex the problem, the more anxious he is to solve it. And with this spirit, nature, time, and space have been captured.

The task before us is to convert our mastery over things external to a mastery over our impulses, our prejudices, our loyalties, and our commitments that come from within. Our vision in the field of education must reach far beyond the development of skills in the cognitive areas, the organization and communication of facts and ideas. We need insight into those affective areas of learning where values are formed, where a definition of the person is evolved, and where working hypotheses about the human family are constantly under scrutiny.

It is in this area of endeavor that we consider the most serious question of all, how to prepare the young to accept the notion of genuine community and the challenge to spend a lifetime in its pursuit.

THEODORE ROSZAK

Educating *Contra Naturam**

SUPPOSE—instead of applauding, praising, but inwardly insisting that we know better—we heard and affirmed what the poet proclaims: that "heaven lies about us in our infancy"; that the child comes to us shaped by nature's hand, a

> Mighty prophet! Seer blest!
> On Whom those truths do rest
> Which we are toiling all our lives to find. . . .

Well then . . . what would education be but the fine art of watching and waiting, and in good time, of summoning forth from the child all that abides within: kingdoms, powers, glories . . . ? So—the task of the teacher would be that of fire-minder: keeper and feeder of the indwelling flame.

Yet if—believing this—we look about us at the world of men which is the result of our labor, what can we do but echo Wordsworth's lament?

> Whither is fled the visionary gleam?
> Where is it now, the glory and the dream?

Our pedagogy deals poorly with these visionary gleams, does it not? How many of us would recognize them if we saw them? In truth, did we ever really believe they were there—within ourselves, as much as in the young?

There is a drawing by William Blake: Age applying the scissors to the wings of Youth. The image tells us what *our* education is all about, *must* be all about in schools financed by church or

* Copyright © 1970 by Theodore Roszak. All rights reserved.

state and enforced upon the young by compulsion. Tolstoy put the point vividly more than a century ago when, throughout the West, compulsory public school systems were coming into fashion with the unqualified approval of all progressive opinion. He was among the few who saw through this pedagogical fad which was destined to become the iron social orthodoxy of every industrial and industrializing society.

> Education [Tolstoy said] is a compulsory forcible action of one person upon another for the purpose of forming a man such as will appear [to society] to be good. . . . Education is the tendency toward moral despotism raised to a principle. . . . I am convinced that the educator undertakes with such zeal the education of the child because at the base of this tendency lies his envy of the child's purity, and his desire to make him like himself, that is, to spoil him.[1]

A harsh judgment. I wince at it as much as you do. For it comes from one who was not only a supreme prophetic spirit, but a gifted teacher of children. And like you I ask, *must* it be so? Is there no other possibility?

Of course there is. There is the possibility Tolstoy himself explored at his own voluntary school for peasant youngsters, Yasnaya Polyana, where, as he put it, "the criterion of pedagogics is only liberty."

"The people," said Tolstoy, "love and seek education, as they love and seek the air for breathing. . . . Some want to teach and others want to learn. Let them teach as much as they can, and let them learn as much as they will."[2]

That is the other possibility: to teach in freedom, in complete freedom, in response to the native inclination of the student; to be a teacher only when and where and insofar as the student authorizes us to be.

But that libertarian possibility has nothing to do with our schools—our "free" public schools, where "free" refers, not to an existential relationship between teacher and student, but to a budgetary arrangement for the financing of a coercive institution.

"*Let* them learn," said Tolstoy. He did not say, "*Make* them learn," because he knew that true education satisfies a natural appetite. Why then resort to force-feeding?

And yet, how much of our educating proceeds from the as-

[1] Leo Tolstoy. *Tolstoy on Education*. Translated by Leo Wiener. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967. pp. 110-11.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

sumption that the young must be *made* to learn? Made to learn . . . tricked into learning . . . charmed . . . inveigled . . . cajoled . . . bribed . . . as if in truth education were *contra naturam* and required clever strategies.

If we do not work from that assumption, then why is education ever anywhere a "problem"? A "problem" requiring, mind you, professional, specialized, full-time, and Herculean attention . . . and prodigious amounts of money?

Why the Compulsion?

If we do not work from that assumption, then why the compulsion? And I do not refer only to the legal compulsion of our lower grades, but to such forms of compulsion as military conscription, which has given us a male college population largely made up, not of young scholars, but of refugees seeking sanctuary in draft-deferrable occupations: the coercive process General Hershey once referred to as "choice under pressure." I speak too of the more subtle compulsions: the lure and the goad of jobs, status, licenses, and credentials.

Now it cannot be unknown to any informed person that in so-called primitive societies, as in many pre-modern civilizations, the whole of vast and profound cultures was easily and naturally transmitted from generation to generation without the intervention of an educational establishment. Rather, the burden of cultural continuity rested on what Paul Goodman has recently called "incidental education": learning in the home, on the job, especially at play, by way of observation and imitation, now and then, here and there, from whoever happens to know, as and when the spirit moves . . . above all, without fuss and bother. The pedagogical theory of all this has been neatly summarized by George Dennison in his book *The Lives of Children.*

> These two things taken together—the natural authority of adults and the needs of children—are the great reservoir of organic structuring that comes into being when arbitrary rules of order are dispensed with.
>
> The child is always finding himself, moving toward himself, as it were, in the near distance. The adult is his ally, his model—and his obstacle (for there are natural conflicts, too, and they must be given their due).[3]

[3] George Dennison. *The Lives of Children.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1969. p. 25.

"Incidental education" . . . how precarious this must sound to us. And yet each generation of Eskimos or Bushmen has stepped forth into life in full possession of the culture. This is not because the culture of primitives is "simpler" than our own: a preposterously ethnocentric assumption. What we mistake for the "complexity" of our culture (when we are not simply confessing to our own sad confusion) is really its technical and academic specialization—the correct measure of which is quantity, not complexity. Quantity is a blunt measure of disorganized amount; complexity measures the richness and integrity of the cultural whole within which all things known and valued should properly find coherence.

In this respect—with reference to coherent moral, religious, aesthetic, mythological, and ritual content—primitive cultures are often far more complex than the down-at-the-heels, *Reader's Digest* and Sunday-supplement version of Western civilization most of our fellow citizens are carrying about haphazardly in their heads. There is even a vast store of purely technical know-how every Eskimo and Bushman must learn—a much greater store than most of us need learn who undo the technical snags in our lives by looking in the Yellow Pages and dialing seven numbers.

I grant you, there have been primitive groups in which harsh forms of indoctrination existed; but I call your attention to the others where little of this has been necessary because the culture, after its own fashion and style, gracefully gave expression to the many dimensions of human personality: the workaday practical, the metaphysical-speculative, the sexual, the communal, the creative, the visionary. Oddly enough, the single aspect of primitive culture many civilized people find least palatable is the often grueling rites of passage—especially those that transpire at puberty. But even these rituals have had at least a natural sanction. they have been the culture's way of dramatizing and illuminating an irrepressible constant in the nature of man—and so of integrating it into the personal and communal pattern of life.

How ironic and revealing it is that in our schools we permit children to be hurt, bullied, and browbeaten if they display too much healthy animal energy in the classroom, or if they fail to revere what the school authorities pose as the social orthodoxies. These conformist demands that arise outside the child's experience may be severely enforced. But as for the biological imperative of puberty which arises mightily within the child . . . of this hardly a candid word may be whispered in many schools. Either teachers play dumb, assuming a comic and unbecoming chastity; or the

so-called "problem" is treated by way of the most fastidiously anti-erotic sex instruction.

Our schools would be chagrined to graduate a student who did not know the ritualistic pledge of allegiance to the flag; but they feel no shame whatever to graduate adolescents who would be (for all their schools had taught them) sexual ignoramuses. And is this not in itself heavy evidence of how pathetically little our own culture knows of the nature of man: that we take a superficial national emblem to be more worthy of ritual elaboration than the deep demands of erotic experience?

Thus, even where primitive cultures have tended to be far more physically brutal than you or I would approve, they have by and large been true to Tolstoy's dictum: "Every instruction ought to be only an answer to the question put by life."

Water finds its level, the swallows fly south in winter, children learn. It is just that simple. That is what Tolstoy knew; that is what the primitives knew. And so they could say, "Let them learn." Societies that trust their culture can let nature take its course, knowing that in their own good time—and usually very promptly—the children will come round and learn what it looks interesting and important to learn; that indeed, their young lives, unless stunted or sidetracked, are nothing but the inquisitive unfolding of potentialities.

But when a society begins to fear that its culture is not interesting or important to the young—that indeed its culture violates nature—then it concludes that education must be *made* to happen: must be organized strenuously into existence and enforced by professionals. And then we have much heavy talk about methods, discipline, techniques, discipline, incentives, discipline, inducements, discipline, the "crisis in our schools" . . . and discipline. We also have blue-ribbon committees, top-level conferences, exhaustive surveys, bold reforms, daring experiments, courageous innovations . . . and the educational establishment grows and grows and grows.

Let us postulate a law: the less secure the culture, the larger the educational establishment. All of us readily recognize that a society in need of heavy policing must be in serious trouble—for the laws have surely lost their power to command respect. Similarly: a society that professionalizes and anxiously aggrandizes its educational establishment—its cultural cops—is also in serious trouble—for the culture has surely lost its capacity to command interest and involvement. The now chronic top-to-bottom state of emergency in our schools does not exist because the educational establishment

is not good enough and needs repair. The crisis is that the culture is not good enough. The educational establishment, with all its compulsions, its disciplinary hang-ups, and—yes—even with its constabulary forces patrolling the corridors—all this only exists in the first place because of the insecurity of the culture.

Once we realize this, we can perhaps see that the feverish efforts of even good-hearted educators to inspire and motivate their students are as pathetic as the belated efforts of our Special Forces in Vietnam to win the hearts and minds of the very people they have degraded and brutalized. Within the context of coercion all efforts to ingratiate are vitiated from scratch. As Tolstoy observed with respect to teachers who seek to achieve "greater freedom" in the schools,

> Those gentlemen . . . resemble a man who, having brought up some young nightingales and concluding that they need freedom, lets them out of the cage and gives them freedom at the end of cords attached to their feet, and then wonders why the nightingales are not doing any better on the cord, but only break their legs and die.[4]

Now if the law we have postulated is true, it leads us to an ironic conclusion about modern Western civilization. If there has ever been a civilization obsessed with what we call "free, public education," it is ours. We invented this quaint institution and we invest a special historical pride in it. We take it as an indisputable sign of social progress that we have built such colossal, affluent, and broadcast school systems. Until, at last, we begin to anticipate that education will soon become our largest "industry"—the major preoccupation of the society. Far from perceiving in this prospect the advanced cultural insecurity it betokens, we feel this is not only right, but ideal. How better to use our wealth, our leisure, and our know-how than to train more teachers, build more schools, process more students?

An Adjunct of National Power

Why does industrial society do this? Tolstoy's contemporary, Bismarck, knew why. "The nation that has the schools," Bismarck observed, "has the future."

Education as an adjunct of national power: a shrewd insight . . . one worthy of such a grim broker in blood and iron. But one did not have to be a Prussian autocrat and militarist to accept the hard-

[4] Leo Tolstoy, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

bitten logic of Bismarck's argument. William E. Forster, who led the good fight for compulsory public education in Great Britain, was a solidly bourgeois Quaker: an industrialist and a self-denying public servant. And here, very revealingly, is how Forster sized things up in 1870 in presenting his successful elementary education bill to Parliament:

> Upon the speedy provision of elementary education depends our industrial prosperity. It is of no use trying to give technical teaching to our artizans without elementary education; uneducated labourers . . . are, for the most part, unskilled labourers, and if we leave our work-folk any longer unskilled, notwithstanding their strong sinews and determined energy, they will become over-matched in the competition of the world. . . . Civilized communities throughout the world are massing themselves together, each mass being measured by its force; and if we are to hold our position among men of our own race or among the nations of the world, we must make up the smallness of our numbers by increasing the intellectual force of the individual.[5]

Note the tell-tale imagery of the argument: energy . . . force . . . power . . . mass. Education as mental steam engine; the school as brain-production factory. No doubt today the metaphors would draw upon computer technics or information theory. But the argument would nonetheless be the same. "Knowledge is power" said Francis Bacon more than three centuries ago at the dawn of the scientific revolution. And from Bismarck to Project Apollo, that fateful dictum has been the ensign of public policy throughout the developed and developing countries.

Tolstoy, whose healthy anarchist instincts were quick to sense which way the power-political winds of our time were tending, gauged the situation shrewdly. This time he speaks of higher education, but the criticism strikes at the same authoritarian-utilitarian vice which was for Tolstoy the curse of all state-supported education:

> No one has ever thought of establishing universities on the needs of the people. . . . The universities were founded to answer certain needs, partly of the government and partly of higher society, and for the universities was established all that preparatory ladder of educational institutions which has nothing in common with the needs of the people. The government needed officials, doctors, jurists, teachers, and the universities were founded in order to train these. . . . It is generally said that the defects of the universities are due to the defects in the

[5] J. Stuart Maclure, editor. *Educational Documents: England and Wales, 1816-1967*. London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1965. pp. 104-105.

lower institutions. I affirm the opposite: the defects of the popular . . . schools are mainly due to the false exigencies of the universities.[6]

The words are as telling in the age of the multiversity as they were a century ago. Yet how easily we have come to accept the assumption—almost as if it were printed on every dollar our schools receive (for in effect it is)—that education exists, not to debate, but to serve the preordained national priorities. How nicely it simplifies everything to define the good student as he who gets the grades that get the job—a deferential simplification that, incidentally, takes on no greater ethical complexity even if the pigmentation of the students who are pressed into service becomes as various as the rainbow.

In the dim and dismal past, there was indeed a time when aristocratic and feudal elites jealously defended a deep vested interest in the plain brute ignorance of peasant masses. Those days are gone forever. Industrial society requires, not illiterate serfs and peons, but trained workmen and trained consumers, bound together in the tight coordination of urban life. As rural routines break down before the thrust of modernization, the well-adjusted citizen must be capable of rapidly assimilating new stores of data; he must respond snappily to the myriad signals, commands, instructions of a changeful new world. The peasant guides his conduct by custom; the industrial worker by information. The peasant lives by tradition; the industrial worker by the news of the day. This is what accounts for industrial society's peculiar obsession with literacy: its facile and unexamined assumption that someone who cannot read is, of necessity, "backward," "underdeveloped."

The "Royal Road to Propaganda"

In 1968, while I was in London, Granada Television produced a documentary film on the civil war that has been raging in Portuguese Guinea for the past several years: an embryonic African Vietnam being contested by Portugal (armed by the United States via NATO) and the Guinean National Liberation Front. The report was presented wholly from the NLF side and it captured much of the idealism of these youthful rebels who are out to free themselves from the dead hand of the imperialist past and to usher their society into the modern world.

At one point, we were shown an NLF jungle school where

[6] Leo Tolstoy, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.

guerrilla teachers were drilling away at children from the bush—and at students considerably older too. One guerrilla, we were told, had only learned to read at the age of 30—and this was now his proudest achievement. We saw the man poring laboriously over a sheet of paper, ponderously shaping out each word with his lips as his finger underlined it, and smiling broadly as each sentence of the text was conquered. It might have been an image out of our own American past: the familiar picture of the Polish or Italian immigrant learning his letters in night school, making the great leap forward into literacy and citizenship.

But what was it our night-school immigrants went on to read once the breakthrough had been made? Legend has it that they all went on to Shakespeare, Tocqueville, and John Stuart Mill. Surely some did. But mostly they went on to the local Hearst press . . . the *Police Gazette* . . . Horatio Alger . . . the Sears catalog. And what was the text our proud Guinean guerrilla was draining of all its insight? Of course: a party bulletin—especially prepared for the feebly literate. It was all his formal education allowed him to cope with. And it was, in any case, about all the party was prepared to give him . . . though perhaps he will eventually graduate to the *Thoughts of Chairman Mao.*

Thus, for the peasant revolutionary as for the vast majority of our own more affluent youngsters, literacy is the royal road to propaganda. Why does industrial—or would-be industrial—society crusade so fanatically against illiteracy? It is hardly because illiterate people are necessarily stupid. They *may* be. But not necessarily so. Recall that high civilizations have been reared on this earth without the aid of the written word. It is hardly because literate people are necessarily smart. They *may* be. But not necessarily so. And to judge by what most of our almost universally literate citizenry patronizes in the way of newspapers, magazines, political oratory, and television entertainment—to judge especially by its gullibility in the marketplace—literacy would seem to bear about as much relationship to intelligence in our society as a Presidential convention bears to a town meeting. It is little wonder then that as of the year 1970, our political leaders come to the convenient conclusion that, in the arena of social controversy, the voice of the universally literate people is . . . a "silent majority."

The simple truth is: industrial society has no use for unschooled people, because unschooled people are too difficult to organize. Lacking the sense of discipline and responsibility the schools provide, lacking the minimal literacy they purvey, people

will not pay what they owe, buy what they ought, report for work on time, appear for induction when summoned, dial the right number, sign on the dotted line, fill out the form correctly. They will not know what the advertisement says, they will not know where to put their mark on the ballot, they will not know why the war is necessary, they will not know wherein lie the genius and honor of their leaders. Unless equipped with a good, practical education—"an education for life"—they may even revert to employing the sense they were born with, put two and two together, and *not* come up with a good solid official five.

Of course I know there are exceptions to the standard: exceptional teachers, exceptional students. But let us be honest about our history: the free public school system is a product of industrial necessity within the context of the nation-state. I am not unaware of the genuine idealism that has been and still is entrusted to this institution. Idealism is often planted in barren earth. Believe it or not, in the high days of the French Revolution, the conscripted citizen army—the *levée en masse*—was regarded as a shining expression of liberty, equality, fraternity. Ask our youth today what they think of this great democratic institution. Institutions have such a tragic way of devouring the ideals they exist to foster.

The function of the educational establishment in industrial society is to treat industrialism and all that it demands as "given": necessary, good, inexorably so . . . a veritable force of nature toward which one must be "practical," not "critical." The schools are built because they produce the skills that will turn the populace into interchangeable, socially serviceable units of a productive economy: at the least, reading, writing, ciphering—but also the sophisticated technical skills necessary for elaborating the industrial plant.

In addition, the schools enforce the virtues of what is called "citizenship": meaning eager acquiescence in the national mystique, patriotic resolution, docility before official superiors, well-developed resignation before externally enforced discipline. In collectivized economies, the schools inculcate a deep and automatic appreciation of ideological inanity; in privatized economies, a profound piety for the privileges of property.

In brief, the elites of all industrial societies take their strength from technicians so narrowly proficient that there is no room in their busy consciousness for a single moral scruple, and from masses so minimally literate that nothing intellectually larger than a commercial advertisement or an official political stereotype can wedge itself into so abbreviated an attention span.

What, then, is the measure of the success of the educational establishment? Let me suggest two examples that vividly represent the excellence the establishment was in reality created to achieve. I could have chosen other examples, but I choose these two because they strike me as having required a superhuman effort in dealing with recalcitrant human material and, obviously, because they give us much to ponder.

"The Balance of Terror"

The first of these is the gargantuan Russo-American weapons system we call "the balance of terror." It is hardly a secret that, since the end of World War II, the building of this juggernaut has been public business number one for both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Nothing in either society—no matter of social justice or humanitarian need—has received more trained manpower or money than these weapons have. Yet there is no system of social ethics—excepting those of Tamerlane, Al Capone, and Joseph Paul Goebbels—which offers a breath of support to this major international enterprise.

Translated out of the official casuistry which covers their true character, these weapons represent an institutionalized commitment to the doing of genocide—perhaps on a global scale. They exist to kill children. Among others, to be sure. Yet I call attention to the children because we are teachers and perhaps this does the most to tear the heart. These weapons are aimed at children, not by accident or unavoidable necessity—but directly, specifically, intentionally, with painstaking malice aforethought, and without apology or guilt. That is what "terror" means. So they have been designed; and so they will be used—when the time comes. They are, as Thomas Merton has called them, "the original child bomb."

Now consider how efficient an educational establishment is required to produce the scientists and technicians who will sell their necessary talents to such a project. Consider how carefully a curriculum must be designed to bring these specialists through 16, 18, 20 years of education without ever once unsettling their conscience. Consider how delicately their acquaintance with the religious and ethical traditions of their culture must have been arranged in order not to preclude their serviceability. Consider with what ingenious cunning they must have been maneuvered through the study of what we call "the humanities." Consider how diligently every inborn trace of moral inquisitiveness had to be

surgically removed from their nature, along with every remnant of a sense of humanitarian service, pity, fellowship, or sheer existential disgust—until at last we had specialists whose only remaining ethical reflex would be, "What they do to us, we do to them—worse!" And how many of these men, one wonders, have come from schools which have fiercely defended their right to have the words of Amos, Isaiah, and Jesus read in class?

The second example I offer is an event now much on the public mind. I refer to what happened in the Vietnamese village of Songmy on March 16, 1968. What has followed from that event has led to a great deal of controversy—though I learn from one public opinion poll, taken at Christmas-time 1969, that 51 percent of those questioned refuse—like the Saigon government—to believe that anything untoward ever occurred in Songmy. But let us assume that the U.S. Army and its Commander-in-Chief know better and can be believed when they tell us that an atrocity there took place. In what grotesque sense of the word can that savage act be called a "success" of our educational establishment?

Once again, consider what a labor it must have been to produce the young Americans capable of such a deed. Such ordinary, such stolidly ordinary young men . . . a few years before they turned their guns on these women and children and shot them, they were perhaps going out for the high school basketball team, planning heavy weekend dates, worrying about their grades in solid geometry. No moral degenerates, these: no more so than Adolph Eichmann was. But given the order to kill, they killed. Not because they were monsters, but because they were good soldiers, good Americans, doing as they had been taught to do. Given the order to kill, they killed—the obviously innocent, obviously defenseless, crying out to them for pity.

Later, one of the men is reported as saying that he has bad dreams about the deed. Did he ever learn in school that there are such dreams? Was he ever asked to decide for himself what his duty is to the state? to his own conscience? to his innocent fellow man? Did he ever hear of the Nuremberg trials? Did he ever have a class dealing with the subject "orders one must consider *never* obeying"? Would any board of education, any PTA now demand that such a class be offered? Would the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare encourage it? Would the U.S. Department of Defense suggest it? Would the local Chamber of Commerce and American Legion permit it?

Well then: what respect has our culture for the moral nature

of our young? Again to quote Tolstoy, our school system "trains not such men as humanity needs, but such as corrupt society needs."

I have said that the great problem with education in our time is that the culture it exists to transmit—the culture of industrial society—is largely worthless and therefore without inherent interest to lively and unspoiled young minds. Worse still, much that industrial society requires degrades all natural humanity. It trespasses against reason, gentleness, and freedom with a force that is plainly homicidal in intensity. That is why the schools, in their eagerness to advance the regimenting orthodoxies of state and corporation—property, power, productivity—have had to distort education into indoctrination. That is why so much is incurably wrong with the schools—all the things keener critics than myself have raised to the level of common knowledge. I need not discuss here what writers like John Holt, Edgar Friedenberg, Jules Henry, Paul Goodman, Jonathan Kozol, and James Herndon have so well analyzed: the compulsion of the system, the tyranny of "right answers," the surrealistic charade of lesson plans, methods, and learning resources, the obsession with discipline, above all the mercenary manipulation of competitive favors—grades, gold stars, good opinions, awards, jobs, status, power.

End to Industrialization?

Nor do I have the time here to persuade those of you who do not already feel it in your bones like the plague, that the West's 150-year experiment in industrialization is approaching a disastrously bad end. Our collective nightmares are available for all to consider: the bleak landscapes of the Brave New World and of 1984, hallucinations of thermonuclear extinction or total environmental collapse. If the bomb does not finish us, then the blight of our habitat very likely will. If not the atom's fire, then the poisoned air, water, earth: the very elements pronounce their sentence of death upon industrial society. Surely they will serve even for the least religious among us as the voice of God.

Whatever health remains in a corrupted culture gathers in the gift of prophecy or also perishes. And woe to the people who fail to recognize their prophets because they come in unlikely forms . . . for prophets are in the habit of so doing. The best and brightest of our young go barefoot and grow shaggier by the day; they scrap the social graces; they take despairingly to the streets to revile and cry doom; they abscond to the hinterlands in search of purity and

simple dignities; they thrust themselves upon us in our public parks and on the stages of our theaters stripped naked and imploring us to "let the sunshine in." We can hardly be so ignorant of our own tradition that we do not recognize—for all the frequent zaniness and gaucherie—the gesture, the presence, the accusatory word that is here reborn before us. The prophet Micah, wild-eyed and wailing in the streets of Jerusalem:

> Arise and go, for this is no place to rest;
> because of uncleanness that destroys
> with a grievous destruction . . .
> Your rich men are full of violence;
> your inhabitants speak lies . . .
> Their hands are upon what is evil
> to do it diligently;
> the prince and the judge ask for a bribe,
> and the great man utters the evil desire of his soul;
> thus they weave it together. . .
> For this I will lament and wail;
> I will go stripped and naked;
> I will make lamentation like the jackals,
> and mourning like the ostriches.[7]

In the finest moments of their outrage and anger, what the young are demanding is what every prophet has demanded of his people: that they too strip away the defiled garment of society, turn away and inward toward the first principles of the conduct of life. The great question is always the same. It was asked of King David, of Imperial Rome, and now of Imperial America, playing self-appointed policeman to the nations and conquering hero to the whole of nature. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?"

For those of us who teach, the return to first principles means a return to Tolstoy's critique of compulsory, public education: an honest admission that what our existing pedagogical machinery is programmed to produce is the man that industrial society in its benightedness thinks it needs; and what industrial society in its benightedness thinks it needs of us is but the shriveled portion of our full humanity—how small a portion one must almost weep to say.

But lest we despair, we must remember that for Tolstoy this

[7] *The Holy Bible.* Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952. pp. 723-24, 726-27.

bleak fact was only a minor blemish on the face of an abidingly beautiful truth; that the spontaneous splendors of the human personality return to us whole in every child and will struggle fiercely to be educated in accordance with their nature. Because he believed this, Tolstoy was prepared—indeed, compelled—to sweep away the state's claim to all educational authority, which could only be the authority to pollute the wellsprings of learning. There can be no more precise way to frame the matter than as he did in raising the question: *who has the right to educate?* His answer:

> There are no rights of education. I do not acknowledge such, nor have they been acknowledged nor will they ever be by the young generation under education. . . . *The right to educate is not vested in anybody.*[8]

It was out of this clear perception that authentic education derives only from the need of the child, not from the right of the adult, that Tolstoy appealed for that which presently animates campus rebellion throughout the Western world—now in the colleges; but soon enough I suspect our high schools too will be ablaze (not only figuratively) with the demand: "freely formed institutions, having for their basis the freedom of the learning generation."

A steep demand. A demand that is bound to seem unthinkable to those who mistake a proper sense of adult responsibility for automatic submission unto the higher powers of the social order and to the bizarre necessities that come down to us from these obsessive profit- and power-mongers. Such resignation in the name of responsibility can only drive us to cling to the established way of things as if it were all the deck there is and everything beyond, the cruel, cold sea. Nothing to do then but clap the would-be mutineers in irons, rearrange the cargo, patch up the leaks, and continue the cruise to oblivion.

But the deck is afire, while the sea, if not benign, is yet filled with a multitude of inviting islands: the possibilities of culture on the far-side of industrial necessity and nationalistic idolatry. The possibilities are there, though I think the diminished consciousness to which we are—most of us—beholden will see them only as mirages or not at all. That is why the expertise and technician-intelligence to which we habitually turn for solutions—as if with the reflex of duty well-learned—are really no help to us: more statistics, more surveys, more professional shoptalk and hair of the dog. As if there could be no knowledge of man that did not wear the official uniform of research.

[8] Leo Tolstoy, *op. cit.*, pp. 111, 114.

But the poet Shelley tells us there are and have always been "unacknowledged legislators of mankind" whose age-old gift it is to "bring light and fire from those eternal regions where the owl-winged faculty of calculation dare not ever soar." A word from them does more than all our science and its dismal train of imitators to reclaim the wasted dimensions of our identity: the buried erotic powers, the truths of the imagination that yield meaning to song, dance, or ritual gesture, but which common literacy will never touch but to kill. Astonishments of the spirit . . . gods of the heights and of the depths . . . thrones and dominions that only the lamp of prophecy reveals . . . and all these inborn glories of our nature useless, useless for achieving what the nations would achieve. We deal here in vistas of experience in which the orthodox ambitions of our society shrivel to nonentity. Yet what else would we have the education of the young be but such an adventure in transcendence?

So the demand is for "freely formed institutions": education beneath the sway of the visionary gleam. From where we stand, a revolutionary demand. And I can hardly be sanguine that many of us here who belong to the establishment will prove to be effective revolutionaries.

Should I be asked, however, "what then are *we* to do?" perhaps, for those having ears to hear, I can offer one minimal suggestion (since the maximum one can do is obvious enough): not a program, not a policy, not a method, nothing to be worked up into a research project or the grist of the conference mill—but only a silent commitment to be pondered in the heart and practiced with unabashed guile when opportunity permits. And it is this: might we not at least let go of our pretensions . . . and then simply let go of the students?

Let them go. Help them to escape, those that need to escape. Find them cracks in the system's great walls and guide them through, cover their tracks, provide the alibis, mislead the posse . . . the anxious parents, the truant officers, the supervisors and superintendents and officious superegos of the social order.

At least between ourselves and the young, we might begin talking up the natural rights of truancy and the educative possibilities of hooky—which is after all only matriculating into the school without walls that the world itself has always normally been for the inquisitive young.

And who knows? Once we stop forcing *our* education on the children, perhaps they will invite a lucky few of us to participate in *theirs*.

ALEXANDER FRAZIER

Here and Now: Points of Decision in the Quest for a New Curriculum

"THE words of a language have their meaning imposed by collective usage. Speaking is a re-using of that accepted meaning, saying what is already known, what everyone knows, what is mutually known." [1] Yet if the inquirer after truth wants to get at the roots of reality, the Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset has pointed out, he must try to "revivify" or "resuscitate" the meanings blurred by custom and usage. This kind of thinking, "something akin to un-dressing, un-covering, removing a veil or covering, re-vealing (=un-veiling), de-ciphering an enigma or hieroglyphic," [2] as Ortega put it, can lead to discovery or revelation. Of course, it may result in nothing more than overexposure.

However, reflection is our present mood, and nudity is in the current cultural mode. Shall we risk, then, a try at uncovering some of our key concepts in curriculum? If we succeed, we may hope to recover meanings useful to us in educating a man for tomorrow's world. If we fail, we know we have other routes to new understandings.

While we have been looking ahead at this conference, we have also been reviewing the past, at least the 25 years since the United Nations was founded and our own Association held its

[1] José Ortega y Gasset. *The Origin of Philosophy.* Translated by Toby Talbot. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1967. pp. 60-61. Copyright © 1967 by W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. With permission.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

first annual conference. Looking back has been a sobering experience. How high our hopes then were for peace in the world! How certain we were, in *Education for All American Youth* and *Education for All American Children*,[3] that we had achieved the ultimate curriculum. By 1950, when three major volumes [4] on curriculum development and supervision were published, we had come to see our task chiefly as learning how to put into effect what we had agreed upon; as we saw it then, the answers seemed likely to be found in greater grass roots involvement of teachers, more adroit social engineering, better human relations, or some combination of these approaches. Historically, the time was indeed ripe for the union of curriculum specialists and school supervisors.

Yet as we seek a context for examining some of the enduring concepts of curriculum and as we ask some of the central questions about what we mean to do, we may agree that we ought to press back further still beyond this kind of consensus. Today I hear far more echoes from the debates of the thirties or even the twenties than reflections from the forties. In fact, I would feel more comfortable to reach back a full half-century to 1920, a year after the Progressive Education Association was organized, to a time when the confusions and the excitement of the post-World War I years had just begun.

What I shall try to do, then, is to refresh a set of central curriculum concepts and pose a series of questions about what we mean to do. In each instance, I would propose that we see ourselves faced with conscious choices here and now that may be made more intelligent by our sense of gratitude to the past and more urgent by our feeling of obligation to the future.

Decision One: Toward Real Reconstruction?

The first curriculum decision of this decade, I would contend, is whether we can and will resuscitate curriculum-making as an

[3] *Education for All American Youth*. Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, NEA, 1944. Also by the same Commission: *Education for All American Children*, 1948.

[4] Hollis L. Caswell and associates. *Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950; B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores. *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1950; Kimball Wiles. *Supervision for Better Schools*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.

active application of the criterion of relevance to the selection of content. Every educator is aware of the urgency of such an effort. Tomorrow's world is on the way if much of it is not already here.

In a document entitled "The Quality of Life and Society in the United States," prepared by the ASCD Executive Committee and adopted by the Board of Directors, the urgency is expressed in this way:

> Our society is undertaking the painful task of consciously reshaping itself by defining more humane ends and providing better conditions and arrangements for human fulfillment. As a result, even now a new common culture would seem to be in the process of creation.
>
> All . . . the institutions and agencies of our society are being faced with newly direct demands for vigorous participation in reshaping our society and creating a new culture.

We might point out, as does the document, that professional associations are also being challenged to act with new or renewed vigor toward the same end.

Need for Genuine Curriculum Reconstruction

The curriculum of our schools must be remade toward new ends and concerns. Of that, there seems no doubt. In question is whether the schools as they now are can see themselves able to do the job. Also in question is whether, after so many years of living with the curriculum as it pretty well has been for most of the life of this Association, we will find ourselves willing to move into what promises to be a very different kind of curriculum activity from that which most of us have known.

Again, can we and will we resuscitate curriculum-making as an active application of relevance to the selection of content? If the answer is to be affirmative, we need to know what we are in for. Let me treat this prospect briefly.

When we go to talk about the selection of content, we are accustomed to getting lost somewhere along the way in arguments over what content encompasses. I wish to avoid this dead end by simply equating content with whatever answers the controlling question that we ought always to ask ourselves when we go to select content: What do learners need to know?

This question, as we are aware, is almost as hard to ask as it is to answer. Indeed, it is such a tough question that we may hesitate to ask it as forcefully or pointedly as it must be asked in

times like ours: Which knowledge is of greatest worth? For we know that we must press still further to add: Greatest worth—for what? At this point, the question becomes so big, at the same time so theoretical and so threatening, that we can hardly take it as seriously meant *for us.*

Our Lack of Experience in Curriculum-Making

In fact, few of us who have entered the curriculum field since the mid-forties have really had the question of relevance of content seriously put to us. Our competencies have developed through the performance of the many necessary and specialized tasks that have to do with curriculum maintenance, repair, and renewal. Deep within the established content of a consensual curriculum, we have learned to find satisfaction in doing well what has to be done to keep the curriculum in shape.

Content is always being reexamined to make sure that it is properly ordered, whether in terms of spelling out sequences of specific learnings or setting up levels of cumulative development. Currently, for example, we have been expending a lot of effort on persuading teachers to spell out precise instructional prescriptions in the form of "behavioral objectives." Content once established must be kept up to date. We have just come through a long season of updating; we have learned to make good use of maverick scholars, who have been able to slip their harness and come to our aid on this vital task. Nearly every day we spend time on evaluating and selecting new study materials to add to the existing mix. We work hard at relocating courses or shifting content around within or among courses. We are experienced, even expert, in making minor curriculum modifications that will answer potentially embarrassing questions about what we are up to in safety education, the drug problem, ethnic needs, and so on.

This is an incomplete list, I know, of the many tasks that confront us in our busy lives. If we like, we can put such tasks under an everyday definition of curriculum-making. I would prefer myself to classify them as tasks of "curriculum-tending." But we need to understand that most of what we have learned to do and do well is subordinate to, or consequent on, the larger and more demanding job of curriculum design or overall curriculum reconstruction.

We must prepare ourselves to learn new skills and find new satisfactions in what faces us as we act to answer the controlling

question of what knowledge is most needed for the realization of new ends, the meeting of new concerns.

Too Much Respect for Established Content

The active application of the criterion of relevance to the selection of content poses another major problem or puzzle for us, to add to the problem of facing up to our present lack of experience in pursuing relevance. Surely, we may feel, much of what we now teach can be taken for granted as a matter of common necessity, true not only for our children and youth yesterday but also tomorrow and indeed for the young everywhere and always. Surely no one cares to quarrel, for example, about aiming at literacy. Or over whether schools should educate for citizenship and cultural identity; these are needs of any society. All of us understand the need for inclusion in any curriculum of whatever equips persons to be useful participants in the world of work; such education again is a common and unchanging need. Schools everywhere, as they can afford to, must teach the first steps in all the valued fields of knowledge so that students who stay at their books long enough will come out fully educated; surely we do not need to debate the value to the individual and to society of a liberal education for all those who can take it.

Doubtless we will find, as we move to reconstruct the curriculum, that some and possibly a good deal of the present content will be continued to serve enduring ends or applied to meet new concerns. We may also find a kind of residuum of content that is so fundamental to any education that it is untouchable on other than its own terms.

Yet we must guard against our own fondness for the familiar. We have, during the past 15 years, sold ourselves on the integrity of the disciplines. Yet for a hundred years and more before then, curriculum-makers had sought, as they will seek again, for ways to draw on and relate content from varied disciplines to meet major human concerns.

We need, in other words, to respect the content we have for what it may do, but to keep before us also the possibility that the value of a good deal of it will need to be tested against its relevance to a new set of ends. Obviously, we can and will find a place in any framework for the residual curriculum of fundamental learnings. How large this segment has to be remains to be seen.

Shall we decide, then, to remake the curriculum? We know

we will need to learn new skills; we know we will have to guard against undue allegiance to the value of the content we already know. But we must act. We can if we will.

Decision Two: Toward New Ends and Concerns?

The second curriculum decision of the seventies, as I see it, is whether we are going to summon up enough energy and stamina to stay with the search for the new ends and concerns that must form a framework for a new curriculum.

We return here, of course, to the controlling question in curriculum reconstruction. We have already asked the question in several forms: What does the learner need to know? Which knowledge is of most worth? For what or toward what ends? Today we would restate the question in some such fashion as this: What are our new major ends or concerns for which we need to find relevant content?

Need To Define New Ends and Concerns

The primary problem in curriculum-making, then, is the setting up of criteria for the selection of content. Are there now major common ends or concerns in our society to which the content of our present curriculum does not adequately attend? If so, then we would agree that we need to search these out; only then can we reconstruct our curriculum so that ends newly or freshly defined are more likely to be realized, new or renewed concerns more likely to be met.

The question of searching out ends is so large and demands so much of us that no wonder we hesitate here, too, to give up our curriculum-tending and to move into genuine curriculum-making. Who is to say what our new ends and concerns are? The statement the ASCD Executive Committee presented to the Board puts the problem this way:

> . . . in a changing society like ours, the curriculum maker we know has to come to decisions from very shaky ground. A dynamic society, a democratic society, a mass society, a pluralistic society, a divided society: what or which or whose society are we to teach toward?

Before I report what the ASCD Executive Committee has tried to do in this regard, I want to review briefly the function of statements of ends and concerns or attempts to define curriculum needs.

Perspective on the Search—1920 to Mid-forties

In the 1920's, as we recall, the statement of Cardinal Principles served as the rallying point for the comprehensive overhaul of content in many if not most of the existing subject fields. The essence of this statement was utilitarian. The school, as it prepared to hold thousands upon thousands of students for a longer period of time at the secondary level, was concerned with helping them learn to function more effectively in all the areas defined as common to human functioning. Some of the principles of curriculum-making in this period may lend themselves to parody, but the pressure for relevance of a kind deserves our respect.

When the depression hit, the school, like the other institutions of our society, went into a state of shock. Questions were raised about the adequacy of a curriculum that seemed to have aimed at educating the young for a world that would never change. Part of the pursuit of the thirties was a continued but more rigorous look at the content fields in terms of what they were good for. This pursuit was perhaps best represented by the series of books on general education issued by the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum of the Progressive Education Association.[5] Coupled with the elements of human functioning from the twenties was a new concern for economic and civic competence, spelled out brilliantly in the early publications of the Educational Policies Commission.[6] The lessons of the thirties were incorporated in the Virginia State Course of Study, reported and rationalized by Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell in their classic textbook on curriculum development.[7]

By the early forties, we were ready for consensus. The coming of World War II may have contributed to our eagerness to reach agreement. As I pointed out to begin with, the consensus stands revealed in *Education for All American Youth* and *Education for*

[5] See, for example: Commission on Secondary School Curriculum, Progressive Education Association. *Science in General Education*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938. Also by the same Commission and Publisher: *Language in General Education*, 1940, and *The Social Studies in General Education*, 1940.

[6] See, for example: *Education for Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, NEA, 1937. Also by the same Commission and Publisher: *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy*, 1938, and *Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy*, 1940.

[7] Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell. *Curriculum Development*. New York: American Book Company, 1935.

All American Children, where we may clearly read the resolution of all the curriculum concerns from 1920 to the mid-forties.

Lack of Interest in Design Since 1945

Since then, or since the end of World War II, our efforts at curriculum-making seem to have been characterized by an absence of interest in problems of total design. Early in the fifties, a few critics brought the earlier emphasis on general education into question; we responded in part by trying for some modifications and additions to serve the needs of the gifted. From 1957 on, the demands upon the curriculum were sharply confined to meeting national manpower needs in science and engineering. Our response took the shape of modernizing the content within mathematics and science and raising our sights so that a higher level of achievement or excellence might be attained by abler students in the academic areas. We did try through relocating some of our courses to get an earlier start in the academic sequences for such students; the shifting downward also included bringing into the high school some courses from the college level. Most recently, of course, our attention has turned to trying for a series of not very successful additions to meet the assumed special needs of the disadvantaged. Using the definitions I have proposed here, most of these developments might be put under curriculum maintenance, repair, and renewal, although I would go so far as to recognize that a few of them might be perceived as curriculum modifications of a somewhat more substantial sort.

But the truth is that thus far during the years our Association has been in existence, our society has not seen any real need for large-scale reconstruction of the curriculum. We would have a hard time to recall a single really challenging statement during the past two decades that has tried to identify new ends and concerns that would justify such reconstruction. One of the last statements [8] made by the Educational Policies Commission let the whole criteria question go by the board. The Commission came out in favor of teaching young Americans to think. The question of criteria for change was thus generalized right out of existence. The Commission itself soon gave up the ghost and, sadly enough, is no longer in business.

[8] *The Central Purpose of American Education.* Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, NEA, 1961.

Sadly, because, as I hope I have indicated, efforts to spell out our needs are highly important in a period of conscious concern for curriculum reconstruction. We would be doing ourselves a real service if we could persuade the National Education Association to reconstitute and recharge the Educational Policies Commission. We are going to need all the help we can get in searching out the new ends and concerns of society as these have meaning for the schools.

What We Are Doing To Help

Meanwhile, we must do what we can. As no doubt you are aware, a new Commission on Goals in American Education has been established by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Its intentions are ambitious, and I know its output will be much to the point. The Association's program for the Generation of New Understandings (GNU),[9] plans for which were developed by the Executive Committee under President Muriel Crosby's leadership and approved last year by the ASCD Board, is well under way; about half the states have set up committees or work forces on some phase of the program, with members of the Executive Committee serving as coordinators or at least helping to get state groups in touch with one another. Paul Klohr tells me that five states have groups at work on problems of curriculum design.

This year, as I have already reported, the ASCD Executive Committee has prepared a statement, "The Quality of Life and Society in the United States," [10] that has been adopted by the Board for implementation. This statement includes a modest attempt to do what I believe we are agreed needs to be done. Perhaps the reader will accept my quick review of the document as an example of what lies ahead as we assess the new ends and concerns of society to provide ourselves with a base for curriculum reconstruction.

In our document, we have defined seven points of critical concern in the emerging new common culture. Our treatment of these in each case opens with a contrast between what our critics stand against and what they stand for. Then the text develops more fully what the proposed new or renewed values or virtues seem to signify. Here I shall merely identify the values and define them most briefly; my hope and expectation is that you will take time to study the

[9] See pp. 47-61.

[10] See pp. 62-84.

document as a whole.[11] My purpose, again, is merely to illustrate the kind of effort we are going to need to make if we are to supply ourselves with criteria for use in making substantial changes in our curriculum.

A Tentative List of New Ends

Here are the seven critical concerns identified by us:

1. *Immediacy.* Concern for the quality of immediate experience; honoring now, the present; joy

2. *Austerity.* Concern for spending time and money on first things; investing in what really matters; essentiality

3. *Authenticity.* Concern for truth, for revelation of facts and feelings; telling it like it is; honesty

4. *Openness.* Concern for new possibilities in every area of human existence; valuing the new, the unfamiliar, the untried; risk-taking

5. *Autonomy.* Concern for "universal emancipation" from institutional, social, or political pressures; deciding for oneself; selfhood

6. *Responsibility.* Concern for living by values that transcend national boundaries, reach out to the world; acting in terms of what one knows to be right; community

7. *Reverence.* Concern for meaning in human experience; searching for the significant; quest for the sacred.

I expect the definition of ends or concerns such as these will be accompanied, as it should be, by a good deal of debate. If we mean business about reconstructing the curriculum, we will want to be as sure as we can be that we are moving in the most highly valued directions. We will need much discussion of the probable dimensions of tomorrow's world, much reflection on the powers and purposes that need to be developed by tomorrow's man.

Can we decide now to undertake such discussion? And move toward the consequent new curriculum commitments? We may agree that we must.

[11] The Board of Directors in adopting the statement called upon members of the Association to engage with their colleagues and others in a National Study Day on May 15, 1970, during which time the implications for local and state action might be considered.

Decision Three: Toward Redefinition of Content?

If we decide, first, that we can reconstruct the curriculum rather than merely modify or repair it and, second, that we are ready to enter into the discussion needed to define new ends and concerns as a basis of curriculum reconstruction, then we might think ourselves well set to meet the challenge of the seventies. But, as I see it, we have one more matter for decision. That is the whole question of what we mean by content. Can we agree that we must denude and clarify this concept so that it returns us in our curriculum thinking to caring about human development as a whole?

We may think that the values or directions we define may serve to ensure this redefinition. But I am not so sure myself. For example, if we were to move toward more concern for immediacy, for the quality of immediate experience, we might quickly agree that we needed to enable children to attend more closely to the world of the arts. Knowing ourselves as we do, we can anticipate that the first impulse might be to take the high school humanities course at its worst and redistribute its content: prehistoric and preliterate art in the primary years, Greek and Roman in the intermediate, the Renaissance in the middle or junior school, and in the high school the arts since then, century by century—in grade 10, the 18th century; in grade 11, the 19th; and in grade 12, the 20th century, probably as an elective.

Content: More Than Facts and Skills

We tend to equate learning of content with getting a hold on facts and skills, that is the point. Earlier I avoided the definition of content, preferring to assume that it is whatever answers the question: What do learners need to know? But I restated the question as: Which knowledge is of most worth for what ends? Knowledge we see, rightly I think, to relate to facts and skills. When I tried for a further restatement of the controlling question in curriculum development, that of setting up criteria for content selection, I phrased it this way: What are our new major ends or concerns for which we need to find relevant content? I hope I did succeed then in relating ends to content or facts and skills. But plainly an element is still missing. There is nobody there yet.

The learner, with his capabilities and needs or, as Dewey [12]

[12] John Dewey. *Experience and Education.* New York: Collier Books, 1963.

sometimes put it, his "powers and purposes," is hard to keep in the curriculum picture. On the one hand, we have some skills to be learned and, on the other, some facts or concepts to be garnered—and out there we have ends to be achieved. But what do we have here in the middle? Is there anybody home?

Making room in school for the learner to pursue his personal purposes and, in the pursuit, to exercise and develop the human powers he was born with is not easy for us ever. The content we have prepared for him, facts and skills formally defined, tends to crowd him out. The space fills up with content. Nowadays, for example, to get him in at all, we have to find the exact step on the staircase or exact spot on the spiral loop where, as we like to say, the learner belongs. Once properly located, he may have to be nudged a little to get started. But once on the way, we assume that feedback and positive reinforcement will keep him moving. If he falls asleep, we will wake him up. If he starts to shout or scream and tries to kick the computer console's teeth in, we take him off the pathway we have prescribed and place him in a class for the emotionally disturbed or the neurologically handicapped, where he stays until he quiets down enough to be returned to the regular program. Or we may transfer him to one of our experimental programs that literally does open up more room, with learners outdoors part of the time perhaps and possibly moving from one study station to another during the day as in Philadelphia's prototypic Parkway Project.

Need for Open Space, Unstructured Time

To function fully or to exercise the full range of their powers, learners do need a certain amount of open space and unstructured time, it would seem. In our mind's eye, as we think about the active learner, we may remember Emile roving the meadows and highlands with his attentive mentor. Or Father Pestalozzi, moving out on good mornings into the environs of his mountain village, surrounded by his lively family of "the little ones," chanting nature rhymes and songs and plucking leaves and berries to be named and counted on their return home.

Or if this kind of respect for the learner's powers and purposes is too much for us, we may recall the experimental schools of the twenties, with their emphasis on freedom of movement and self-expression, a phenomenon that was not confined to Greenwich Village; it was found in the suburbs of many of our great cities—

New York but also Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, and St. Louis. We might note in passing that the small experimental school seems to be coming back; a growing number of such enterprises is reported as being set up by disillusioned teachers and subsidized by disenchanted parents; several newsletters, I understand, enable the schools to keep in touch.

The thirties saw, too, as we remember, a strong strand of concern for what was called the "experience curriculum." In the Eight-Year Study, the most successful schools were the schools most frankly and fully experimental. In all these undertakings, the focus was on learning through doing something that seemed to the learners to be worth doing, with skills developed and facts summoned up as they were needed. This was also the era of the community school movement, mostly a rural phenomenon but with many implications for all schools.

I wonder whether we do not still perceive this kind of relationship between the developing powers of the learner and the formal stuff of learning to be the ideal, indeed the essential, base of curriculum design. The learner must remain in the middle doing what he has to do to grow up, exercising and developing his powers in pursuit of purposes that are meaningful to him, and growing in strength and effectiveness as he incorporates into his behavior the competencies and concepts that he has reached out for at the margins of his own life-centered, performance-centered, or process-centered personal curriculum.

Powers Plus Facts and Skills

Today, of course, most of us would consider ourselves irresponsible if we did not make sure that in his growing the learner did "learn," as we still say, the skills we have now found out how to "staircase" so well and the concepts and structures we have discovered how to lay out so authoritatively for him to grow into. We are not willing to leave the gaining of skills and concepts quite so much to chance as were some of the early progressives. Dewey had faith that by keeping the criterion of continuity before him the teacher would be able to plow into group experience what was needed. We would want to make certain, as we know we can, that the basic skills and concepts have been learned, that the learner has mastered the untouchable fundamentals of content or the residual curriculum of which we talked earlier, so that his behavior will be more powerful than it otherwise could be.

During the past 15 or 20 years our attention has gone so almost entirely to the knowledge components of curriculum content that we may have neglected to retain the power component in the picture. At this point, however, there are many signs that we are ready to return from the margins to the middle. We have been talking a good deal about independent learning. The concept of open space in the school is well understood architecturally if not always instructionally. We see the need for more kinds of specialized work and study stations as well, for fuller and more varied collections of resources, for flexibility in organizing, staffing, and scheduling. For some schooling, we are moving out of a given school setting into facilities located in other parts of our community. We are beginning to reexamine at almost every level the hurdles or barriers of achievement standards in skills and concepts that have excluded students from further study, students whose development of personal power, had it been looked at, might have shown a very different prospect of success; we are beginning to find that it gives us useful data when we look at who people are and what they can do rather than only at what they "know."

Need To Identify and Define Personal Powers

We are faced, then, with a decision as to whether we can restore and maintain as a central element in content the learner's powers and purposes. My feeling is that in order to do so we must give more attention to what we mean by "powers" than we have in the past. The trichotomizing of learning into the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor realms has had its uses but has been largely preempted for the programming of skills and concepts. We are finding several other attempts to define the learner's powers fresh and more broadly useful. Louise Berman's [13] is one of the most promising. The notion of "life skills" as defined in the ASCD 1969 yearbook [14] is also provocative. George Leonard talks of some neglected aspects of human functioning.[15] We need many more such efforts if we are to build out this core element of curriculum content.

[13] Louise M. Berman. *New Priorities in the Curriculum.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968.

[14] Louis J. Rubin, editor. *Life Skills in School and Society.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.

[15] George B. Leonard. *Education and Ecstasy.* New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

I would like myself to propose a list of personal powers or human functions to add to the mix:

1. *Performing.* Acting, acting out, gaming, interpreting, operating, playing, practicing, putting on, role playing, taking part in

2. *Getting together.* Befriending, communing, contending, dialoguing, interacting, joining, loving, relating, sharing, working side by side

3. *Getting with it.* Enjoying, expressing, giving out, going out to, reacting, receiving, responding, suffering, taking in

4. *Finding out.* Discovering, experimenting, inquiring, investigating, problem solving, questioning, searching, seeking, testing

5. *Making.* Classifying, composing, constructing, generalizing, inventing, modeling, organizing, planning, putting together, shaping, theorizing

6. *Controlling.* Changing, directing, managing, persuading, preparing, projecting, teaching, trying out, willing, wishing

7. *Signifying.* Finding meaning in, honoring, judging, meditating, questing, reflecting, remembering, thinking about, valuing, worshiping

8. *Persisting.* Coming back to, enduring, hanging onto, holding on, resisting, resolving, returning to, reviving, surviving, trying.

Each of the powers, as I have identified them, is something the human being is born with; we may assume that man is pre-programmed or genetically equipped to engage in the exercise of such powers and that his powers will and do grow and develop whether the school attends to them or not. Every man in every culture is born with these powers and grows toward their increasingly effective exercise, shaped by whatever there is to be shaped by, the physical and social environment, the school when there is one, and always his unique experience as a human being.

Respect for Human Competence

In the years immediately ahead, we ought to be able to improve our insight into the nature of such powers. Very recently, we have gained substantial new understandings. The generative grammarians, under Noam Chomsky's leadership, have helped us appreciate the power of very young children to generalize from whatever data they find in their speech community the principles by which

an infinite number of new sentences can be generated; children come to school, we now know, with a surprisingly high level of grammatical competence in their native language. As a result of Claude Lévi-Strauss's review of a half-century of research on the languages of preliterate peoples, reported in *The Savage Mind*,[16] anthropologists are taking another look at the innate power of man to order and classify his experience. Our own recent experience in getting together with the parents of the disadvantaged and the leaders of the poor must have given us ample evidence that inadequate or interrupted schooling does not necessarily prevent the development of essential human powers; we are meeting and learning to work with many very powerful people.

The young human being must pursue his purposes and develop his powers toward functioning fully as a human being. Life, of course, is the grand curriculum. But we have before us the decision of whether to make the school a true partner in the process of total human development. Can we keep, in the middle of the school curriculum, room and time for experience that is genuinely life-related? We need to decide that we will. We seem to be in the process of deciding that we must.

Summary and Conclusion

Here, in summary, are the decisions that it seems to me we must make in our quest for a new curriculum:

First, we must decide that we can leave our curriculum-tending for the moment and move into the perilous undertaking of genuine reconstruction, knowing that we will have to master new skills and stay away from the pitfalls of allegiance to the consensual curriculum we have come to know too well.

Second, we must decide to enter into the discussion and debate from which major ends and concerns or values will be newly defined or freshly redefined as a guide to curriculum reconstruction.

Third, we must decide to broaden our notions about content to include once more a basic respect for the learner's powers and purposes and to make sure they are put in the middle of the mix.

Following Ortega's advice, what I have tried to do has been to denude or defoliate some of the key concepts in curriculum thinking so that our decisions may be based on a refreshed awareness of original meanings and intentions.

[16] Claude Lévi-Strauss. *The Savage Mind*. Translated by George Weidersfeld. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Let me conclude by trying to glorify the metaphor of growth or life that I have considered central to my treatment of the curriculum design problem. I shall make the attempt by using an event reported in the autobiography of Sean O'Faolain, author of *A Nest of Simple Folk* among other works. Born in 1900 or thereabouts, the son of a policeman, and brought up in Cork, O'Faolain lived near a theatre where he often enjoyed the rampage and romance of provincial theatricals. But at the age of 15, when he witnessed an Abbey Theatre play by Lennox Robinson, his eyes opened to a new world. On the stage were real people facing real problems, the kind of people and problems he had always known but never seen as the stuff of drama. In his recollection of this incident, which changed his life and led him to become a writer himself, O'Faolain remarks of the new Irish realists who were his teachers:

> They had seen actual life with heightened emotions. I had not. They had dreamed with their eyes wide open. They had dreamed on the stone pillow of hard fact. In one word, they had lived. This boy that I was, had yet to "live." [17]

Earlier, in describing the Lancasterian National School that he attended as a boy, the author makes it clear that he found no help there in understanding the world about him. But to return to Sean at 15. He had not lived, as he thought of it:

> Still, he was warmhearted and sensitive . . . and life, though in its blind cruelty it often does, by the million, crush such creatures, never wholly betrays them. . . . Life feeds such children as one feeds motherless birds with minute bits and scraps to begin with, and richer and perhaps tougher gobbets as their digestions grow in power. This boy had already seen touches of cruelty at school, hard poverty about him, wild street scenes, his father's share in a moment of defeat, his mother's deep unhappiness, the tough lives of his forbears. . . . These and many other such hints were stored in his pool of memory. . . . Before he could truly see anything of what we call the nature of life these hints . . . needed to be enlarged, enhanced, heightened. They needed to strike his imagination before they could pierce his intelligence, or his heart.[18]

Life is indeed the grand curriculum—but what a place there is deep within life for the creative curriculum of a school that knows what the young cry out for, what they really want and need.

[17] Sean O'Faolain. *Vive Moi!* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1964. p. 112. Copyright © 1963, 1964 by Sean O'Faolain. Reprinted by permission.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 112-13.

PART II

Papers Adopted for Study and Action
at the 1969 and 1970 ASCD Conferences

The Generation of New Understandings: A Program of Study and Action

The GNU Program was initiated by the 1968-69 Executive Committee under the leadership of President Muriel Crosby. In March 1969, it was approved for implementation by the ASCD Board of Directors.

The present document is an expansion of the original content framework, mostly in the form of added questions for study. The enlargement comes from the ideas of the current Executive Committee, which worked through the first statement in its October 1969 meeting.

It is hoped that the expansion of the framework will forward the generation of new understandings by all those who are accepting the challenge of this common venture in professional self-education.

October 1969

ALEXANDER FRAZIER
President, ASCD, 1969-70

WHAT we seem to be confronted with, as we approach the seventies, is the necessity of assuming a newly vigorous leadership to meet the expectations of a newly demanding society. Mounting and relentless, these social expectations are plainly more political than those of the sixties. The forces pressing us are also more severely critical. The charge is that public education has accepted and rationalized its failure to meet the simplest needs of many sections of the school population and that it is blind to its obligation to identify and meet emerging needs of all sections of an ever more complex society.

The expectations are thus more frightening than those of the immediate past. Schools are being expected to do what frankly they

do not know how to do. Moreover, we see less help at hand than we did ten or twelve years ago. Then, the academic community rallied to the demand that goals be elevated and content modernized in the subject fields. We grew to count on a new kind of partnership between the schools and the scholars.

But where can we who work in curriculum, supervision, and instruction turn today in meeting the new expectations? Apparently, we must ourselves search out the sources of help. We must find data and ideas where we can, in such areas as ethnology, physiology, and the sciences of verbal behavior as well as in more familiar foundational fields. We must also propose the new programs that are yet to be built on the understandings generated by such a search.

With a sense of urgency, the Executive Committee proposes that the resources of the Association be mobilized for the generation and implementation of new understandings to meet the new demands. To begin with, the Committee has identified a set of three generative concepts to serve as a kind of content framework for our first efforts. These concepts—relevance, accountability, and modifiability [1]—are powerful and pervasive. The items included under each concept are here defined in terms of questions that may be understood to reflect our present sense of the issues that need study. Neither the items nor the questions are intended to be all-inclusive, and both are meant to stand as illustrative of the usefulness of the concept under which they appear rather than as fixed in the framework.

The test of the framework will come, of course, as it is found hospitable to the crucial concerns of the membership.

I. Relevance

Critical examination of the relationship of the experiences provided through education to the real needs of those being educated is not new. Such concern has always been part of the process of curriculum development.

However, a new sense of the perils or problems of institutional

[1] The Executive Committee drew these concepts (as well as the specific items) in part from a series of reports made to it at its October 1968 meeting: a report from the staff of what it considers major concerns to which the Association should address itself; a report of the June 1968 meeting of the Steering Committee of the Board of Directors; and a report from a meeting of chairmen of committees, commissions, and councils in September 1968.

living has alerted us to our own ease of accommodation to things as they have been, even when we realize that times have changed. Also the public concern has mounted sharply as established ways of working have failed to meet new demands.

The question of relevance, then, becomes a central element in the new criticism of education. The curriculum in general is being subjected to reexamination. Modifications are being proposed to meet the specific needs of minority groups and the need of all to understand better the multi-ethnic nature of our culture. Education for more effective behavior as citizens is under scrutiny as a possible major focus of curriculum revision during the seventies. Teacher education is receiving another and harder look.

The outline to follow tries to give some sense of the crucial nature of the concept of relevance. Perhaps it may serve to rough out a few of the dimensions of a program of study and action that might yield new understandings in this area.

A. *Curriculum Design*

Curriculum development during the sixties was focused on modernizing the content of the subject fields. No doubt the time has now come to ask questions about the new content in relationship to general goals.

But perhaps the problem of relevance may better be approached by reviving our concern for overall curriculum design. Such energy as went to this end during the sixties often seemed to be more concerned with logistics, organization and staffing, and housing than with trying to imagine genuinely new frameworks for selecting and putting together the learning experiences of greatest worth to the student and to society.

As we move into the seventies, we will want to search for new concepts of order or design as well as to reexamine and redefine the older language we have learned to use in thinking about curriculum design problems.

Sample questions:

What do the kinds of person or persons wanted by our society need to learn? Who speaks to us of these needs?

What do those who are trying to think ahead have to say about educational goals oriented to the future?

What would we mean today if we talked about the general education component of the curriculum?

Are there purposes that call for the selection and combination of content or learnings from varied fields and sources? If so, how can the content be held together? Do the older concepts of integration and coordination still have meaning?

How does the new content of any given subject field contribute to the meeting of pressing personal and social needs?

Are there ideas about the curriculum to be learned from some of the storefront schools? Or the "wildcat" private progressive schools appearing in the suburbs?

What does the new concern for the primacy of the person indicate as to the role or function of structure in the curriculum?

What alternative designs for consolidating relevant learnings can we invent? How can we test them?

B. *Ethnic Curriculum Modifications*

To be made fully meaningful, the curriculum may need to be modified for children and youth from some ethnic groups. The content of such fields as history and literature may overlook or ignore the contributions from neglected groups. Their needs and problems may be dealt with in a perfunctory or peripheral fashion.

Members of these groups may also require or profit from experiences that would seem less important for others. As an example, some children are faced with forces of distortion that operate to create negative self-images. The young, even the very young, may need help in learning to protect themselves from these forces and, when they can, to change them through the effective exercise of power.

Our curriculum in general highlights the achievements of Western civilization at the expense of what has been contributed by Africa, Latin America, and Asia. Children whose origins lie in the Third World thus suffer from ignorance of their extended past. The understanding of all children is lessened by ignorance of non-European and non-North American cultures.

Sample questions:

What needs to be done to adjust the ethnic balance in the selection of figures, events, literature, and the like for study by all children and youth in our schools?

What is meant by ethnic identity? What contributes most to its development?

What kinds of course offerings with specific relevance to a given ethnic group should be included in the program?

Are limits to be placed on the addition of ethnic offerings? What about Middle European cultures?

What criteria should be applied to the selection of instructional materials for ethnic and multi-ethnic education? What sources of evaluation of new materials are there that help screen out the shoddy and opportunistic?

How can students be helped to understand the way in which society creates a sense of values in its members?

How can adult advisers from ethnic groups best be used in planning courses or experiences and in reviewing materials? What problems arise in such collaboration?

How can continued concern for supra-ethnic or common national goals be assured? Is there need to redefine and enlarge these goals?

C. *Political Socialization*

Education for the more effective exercise of political power seems to be taking place largely in the streets, squares, and public halls of our towns and cities. The relevance of what is now being done toward political socialization in the schools is at question.

Our past approach may have been aimed at accommodation to society rather than at self-realization within or through it or improvement of it. We may have seen the young as needing chiefly to submit themselves to the discipline of group living—to learn to give and take, to take turns, to be good members of the group, to get along together.

But we are aware now that the individual must learn, too, to affect the functioning of the group for his own welfare and the group's eventual good. The meeting of minority needs, concern for equity and justice, maintenance of respect for the person, innovation in institutional procedures, and addition to or enlargement of common goals—all these may require division and debate. Dissent upon occasion becomes an obligation. We are aware, too, that political socialization for the effective exercise of power in a democracy may be needed by teachers as well as students, indeed by all of us.

Sample questions:

In what directions do we need to rethink our traditional concepts and concerns in social education? Is there a developmental sequence to be laid out toward learning to assume responsibility and to use it well?

Are there needed insights into individual-group relationships which require new kinds of content and experiences in school?

Do we need to do more with the study of comparative political systems?

What are our present goals in political socialization? What ought they to be?

Do we need to evaluate the effectiveness of student councils and service projects in political education?

What are the possibilities of extending political education into the community?

What kinds of parent education and involvement may be useful in building acceptance of a more action-oriented political education of the young?

What skills do teachers need in their new exercise of power in bargaining and negotiation? Are these a proper area of in-service education?

To what extent is curriculum leadership being redefined in terms of conflict management and resolution? How do we learn the new competencies that may be required?

D. *Teacher Education*

Changes in the functions and roles and in the status of teachers are arising from many new circumstances. These changes challenge the relevance of present programs of teacher education to current and future needs.

Teaching is being analyzed as a set of somewhat disparate functions and roles. New combinations of personnel forward new kinds of specialization and pose new problems of relationship. The changes are undergirded by newly available materials and technology and supported by new designs in school housing.

The status of the pre-college teacher has been greatly dignified during the past ten years. The content reform movement has focused on the reeducation of the teacher as a colleague in the academic community. The teacher's own associations have gained recognition of his right to participate more fully in decisions that have to do with curriculum, instruction, professional study, and the like.

Sample questions:

How can teachers be better prepared for assuming a larger responsibility in curriculum planning and greater autonomy in the selection of instructional materials?

How is the experiential element in teacher education best provided? And what are the chief ends?

Is an undue emphasis being placed on skills and practice in new programs of teacher education? Does the development of the teacher as a person need a larger place?

What do we need to know about recruiting and educating teachers for the inner city? What key experiences and competencies does a young person need for teaching there?

What new skills are needed by teachers as they share responsibility for planning together for a larger group of students?

What skills are needed for working with paraprofessional and auxiliary personnel?

Is debate still in order about the balance of time between general and professional education? Is more time needed for the adequate education of teachers?

What problems arise as teachers are educated to become members of the larger community of scholars?

II. Accountability

Schools and school people are being called to account by a range of deeply concerned parties. The granting of federal monies has carried with it an unprecedented demand for evidence of results from new programs. Several states have instituted new testing programs designed to spotlight the success or failure of school systems. The national assessment program is perceived by many as headed in the same direction.

At the local level, the call to account arises from several sources. Students are making demands upon high schools as well as colleges for programs of greater relevance. Parents in some urban school districts are seeking the decentralization of authority toward the end that each sub-community exercise control over its own schools—control that would extend to every aspect of curriculum, instruction, and supervision.

Within the schools themselves, issues of accountability are arising between the traditional hierarchal organization and teacher organizations.

Other problems could no doubt be identified. But the notes to follow may be enough to indicate the size and scope of accountability and thus to justify its inclusion in our list of three generative concepts.

A. *Student Participation*

Students are presently exploring and testing out the extent to which the school should be responsive to their sense of what is right and proper or what they most need. In a good many schools, this concern has centered on the revision of dress and grooming codes. In some, demands have been made for the addition of ethnic studies.

The trend seems to be toward widening the range of concerns to include the many ways in which student life is regulated by the school. A major staff problem is to assess the adequacy of present avenues of communication and opportunities for collaboration.

The larger problem, of course, is to learn how to provide for responsible student participation in the many facets of school life in which it may prove invigorating.

Sample questions:

What can school do to help students learn to participate effectively in making decisions on those matters that affect and concern them?

Where does competence begin and end in this matter?

What are the values and limits of student representation on regular faculty committees?

How can teachers best be helped to develop and use more effective ways of planning with students in the classroom?

What are we learning from our experience in revising dress and grooming codes?

What are some of the ways to deal with protest when it seems to us to threaten to get out of hand? What limits should be set up? How enforced?

Can we develop new forms of school organization that elicit more fully and make better use of constructive student criticism and concern?

What changes are needed to bring evaluation and marking into line with new values?

What is the role of parents in setting up procedures for student participation? How may parents be involved?

B. *Faculty Decision Making*

The boundaries of teacher power are being determined in a historic series of confrontations between boards of education and teacher organizations. The inclusion of an increasing number of

aspects of curriculum, instruction, and supervision within these boundaries has given rise to new kinds of issues and anxieties.

Perhaps the major concern at present is the reconceptualization of the role of supportive personnel and services in the process of faculty decision making. Decisions seldom rise above the quality of the information and ideas on which they are based. The problem is to relate the expertness now available without interference or intervention in the exercise by teachers of their newly established rights.

Another need may be to try to set up new kinds of organization in the school and district that may forward the development of teacher competency in decision making. New supportive services may also be needed.

Sample questions:

What is the place of bargaining and negotiation in curriculum development? Selection of instructional materials? In-service education? Selection of teachers and administrators? Evaluation of personnel?

How can we continue to highlight the common concern of all staff members for the welfare, growth, and development of children and youth?

What responsibility remains to administration for seeing to it that this concern is as productive as possible?

What devices can be invented to forward a strong sense of accountability among teachers' for the relevance and results of their decision making?

What kinds of skills do teachers need to develop as they exercise increasing responsibility for decision making in vital areas?

How can central or other services contribute to the development of these skills?

Are there new services needed by teachers in the assumption of new responsibilities?

What new organizational patterns are being developed in the individual school to support the emergence of strong teacher leadership? In the district as a whole?

C. *Community Control*

The demand for decentralization in the control of schools arises in part from a conviction that the schools have lost a sense of accountability to their immediate communities. With greater

local control, the community could set expectations and demand results. The faculty would be accountable to the parents of children in the school rather than to the personnel in downtown or regional offices. Such a prospect poses many problems.

One kind arises from the nature of the new expectations that may be set by lay boards. Professional employees will need to join forces with laymen to analyze the situation and lay out realistic steps by which curriculum and instruction may be reoriented to focus more directly on the achievement of newly urgent goals.

Another may come from misunderstandings or disagreements about how to go about assessing progress toward the goals. Teachers and other professionals in the picture may need to learn how to relate in new ways to possibly impatient patrons.

Sample questions:

What are the benefits and limitations of community participation in a school system serving numerous communities? To what extent must control be decentralized before it can become effective?

What criteria of size and function should prevail in the decentralization of control in urban areas?

How do teachers and other staff members gain needed protection in their jobs under decentralization?

What kinds of local curriculum and other needs are likely to be defined? What kinds of skills and services will be needed by persons in charge of new community schools?

How can the development of local leadership be forwarded both in the lay community and among school personnel?

In what ways can local control contribute to improvement or reconstruction of the community?

On what bases should school personnel operate to provide needed professional perspective and competencies to newly constituted local boards in urban settings?

What kinds of problems arise in such areas—standards of achievement, pressure for results, etc.?

D. *Accountability for Supervision*

Shifts in the location of authority have thrown supervisory personnel into confusion regarding the lines of their responsibility. Still more perplexing, perhaps, will be the efforts that lie ahead to redefine and relocate the function of supervision to ensure the

maintenance and renewal of teaching competence and the instructional program.

Teacher self-supervision may well be the focus of the new era. If so, one of the problems to be faced will be the discovery of devices or forms of organization that will promote group interaction and evaluation. Also leadership will still need to be provided, even though it may carry no official authority.

The role of official supervisory personnel is plainly at issue. Role redefinition will come in part from transfer of responsibility to teachers. Partly it may come from the identification of new needs that teachers may feel as they assume greater responsibility for evaluation and improvement of curriculum and instruction.

Sample questions:

Where should supervisory services be located to support teachers most effectively? What new kinds of services may be required?

How can allegiance to high standards be maintained in the face of rising lay control of curriculum, instruction, and supervision?

What linkages can be developed and tested out between planning in the local school and in the district as a whole?

How can more kinds of information be generated in schools to raise the level of local decision making?

What promising developments are there in cooperative or peer supervision? What problems can be defined in this area?

What devices are teachers finding useful in the study of their own teaching?

What are the training needs of team leaders, department chairmen, and other teacher leaders? How are these needs being met?

How is the role of official supervision being redefined? Do supervisors need new competencies? Is there still a place for the general supervisor?

Can supervisors survive if they are excluded from the decision making related to curriculum and instruction?

III. Modifiability

The new expectations being set for the schools include the better teaching of students with whom we have not done so well in the past. Fortunately we are developing a new optimism about what may be done with students of poor background if we get to them early enough—or if we use all the ideas we can get from newer

psychological approaches. Capacity to learn, we are beginning to say, is developed by some kinds of experiences better than by others. Children who do well in school have had the right kind of help in developing their capacity to learn. All children deserve such help.

Also, we are reexamining the barriers we have put up against poor achievers in various sectors of society and testing whether the barriers have not themselves contributed to failure. College entrance requirements and qualifications for jobs are both being relaxed for given groups.

The modifiability of adult behavior is of new interest to us. In working with teachers, for example, we are learning some things that may move the improvement of teaching onto a new base and also alter some aspects of supervision.

The notes that follow rough out some of the dimensions of the concept of modifiability that may deserve our study.

A. *Creation of Ability To Learn*

Children are born with capacity to learn that is either developed or diminished by the experiences they have. We are newly aware that the earliest years are of great importance in creating ability to learn and thus we are undertaking the task of multiplying the opportunities for early childhood education, particularly for the children of the inner city.

We are also newly alert to the need to evaluate the curriculum for young children. A number of attempts are in progress to set new goals and provide new kinds of experiences in the first years of school.

A larger task may be before us if we decide to reexamine curriculum and instruction for all ages and perhaps for all children and youth in light of the question of whether what we now offer is as stimulating to the development of ability to learn as it might and ought to be.

Sample questions:

How useful is the concept of social intervention in the education of the intellect? Is creation of ability to learn of importance in all or only some of our sub-communities?

What dimensions of education (physical, cognitive, perceptual, etc.) need to be kept in the picture?

What results seem to be coming from new programs in early childhood education? What criteria need to be applied to these programs?

Are we using what we already know about developing the higher levels of thinking and reasoning in children and youth?

Are there some dangers in putting so much emphasis on early education? May we tend to accept undeveloped capacity in older learners as something about which we can do little?

How important is the teacher's attitude toward the learner in helping him set new expectations for himself? How does the teacher transmit these expectations?

What is the prospect that the creation of new kinds of materials and resources will forward the development of ability to learn?

What new approaches to learning seem promising? What results are promised by psychomotor and perceptual training, behavior modification theories, simulation and gaming, programmed learning, and computer-assisted instruction?

B. *Development of Personal Powers*

We enter the seventies with a new respect for the person, equipped with innate powers for coping with his experience and finding satisfaction in and through it. For example, the linguists now tell us that man is genetically programmed for speech. The child comes to school with a mastery of the rules for making an infinite number of new sentences in his native language.

Growth rather than mastery is the goal in the development of human powers. These powers—among them, expressing, responding, and performing; investigating and questioning; interacting; organizing, ordering, and creating; and being and reflecting—develop as they can and must toward human functioning and fulfillment.

The question before us is whether in the school itself we have attended as fully as we should have to providing the optimum conditions for growth of the personal powers, the essentially human capabilities that really matter most.

Sample questions:

What human powers and potentialities may we have neglected in school?

What difference may there be in thinking of fields like the arts and the humanities, sex education, and citizenship education in terms of developing personal powers?

Do we need to put the arts nearer the middle of our school program?

To what extent is our new concern for inquiry, discovery, and independent study related to release and growth of personal powers? To what extent to finding answers in common?

Has the differentiation of the cognitive from the affective and psychomotor realms worked against integrating personal powers?

Has the arena for creative behavior in school been sufficiently enlarged?

Are the institutional practices of school more supportive of learning for mastery than learning as growth?

Can we do the job we want to do with the subject matter we now have?

C. *Rehabilitation of Learners*

Dramatic rescue results are being reported from a variety of contexts with inadequate learners of many ages. The successes seem to come in part from the setting of new expectations of success with persons or groups that may have been written off in the past. Harder or more ingenious teaching can pay off.

But also changes in the situation may make the difference. Federally subsidized programs of on-the-job training with full pay for hard-core unemployables have now enrolled nearly a quarter of a million persons, whose retention rate in their new jobs is close to normal.

New goals may also be important. Teaching for vigor and impact in the use of oral language is very different in kind from teaching for conformity to the standard syntax.

Altogether, there is a new optimism in the air about succeeding with more learners than we have in the past.

Sample questions:

Are the motivational systems presently depended upon in school unduly class-biased?

Does more attention need to go to the learner's own self-direction? Is the imposition of authority the damaging factor in some situations?

What can we learn from the programs of storefront schools? From those of the new "wildcat" progressive schools in the suburbs?

Are new ends for schooling the secret? Does evaluation need to be more inclusive?

What lessons are we learning from reinforcement theory and contingency management?

Are there guidelines for us in the success that industry is having in its program of educating the so-called unemployables?

Does the success of service projects or undertakings like the Peace Corps or Job Corps have implications for teaching?

What successful programs are being developed to help potential dropouts stay in school (as in Pontiac, Michigan)?

D. *Modifiability of Teaching and Supervisory Behavior*

New ways of providing teachers and prospective teachers with feedback on their effectiveness seem to promise a breakthrough in helping teachers identify and work directly on their own needs for improvement.

Many of the devices relate to the verbal behavior of teachers. Teachers need help in interpreting records of their behavior. Some ways of collecting data, such as video tapes, may also yield to less formal kinds of interpretation.

Supervisors can use studies of teaching behavior to assess their own effectiveness in promoting change. Some of the devices may prove adaptable to recording supervisory behavior, as in conference sessions and possibly in group work with teachers.

Sample questions:

What kinds of data are most useful in determining teaching effectiveness? What combinations of data sources are useful?

How can the collection and study of data on their own teaching best be forwarded for teachers on the job?

What kinds of supervisory services are most likely to be useful to teachers engaged in the study of their own teaching?

What other kinds of data-collecting devices and systems of analysis are needed besides those already developed?

What kinds of data-collecting devices are available for assessing the effectiveness of supervision?

How can the improvement of learning be assessed in relationship to changes in teaching? In supervision?

What do teachers working in teams learn about teaching from one another?

What kinds of data do supervisors need about their performance that might make a difference?

ALEXANDER FRAZIER *

The Quality of Life and Society in the United States

OUR society is undertaking the painful task of consciously reshaping itself by defining more humane ends and providing better conditions and arrangements for human fulfillment. As a result, even now a new common culture would seem to be in the process of creation.

All the organizations as well as the institutions and agencies of our society are being faced with newly direct demands for vigorous participation in reshaping our society and creating a new culture. As the organization that represents the official leadership charged with making decisions about what is learned in the schools of the United States, our Association carries a burden of responsibility second to none.

But in a changing society like ours, the curriculum maker we know has to come to decisions from very shaky ground. A dynamic society, a democratic society, a mass society, a pluralistic society, a divided society: what or which or whose society are we to teach toward?

One source of insight would seem to be the contentions of the growing number of counter cultures on the scene today. Part of what follows is an effort to identify some of the major concerns from these cultures for us to look at and think about together.

Seven such concerns are defined here. *Each may be charac-*

* This paper was written for the ASCD Executive Committee. It was reviewed by a subcommittee composed of Paul R. Klohr, Alvin D. Loving, Sr., John D. Greene, and Fred T. Wilhelms. The paper was adopted for study and action by the ASCD Board of Directors, March 19, 1970, at the 25th Annual Conference, San Francisco, California.

terized by a set of "yeas" and "nays" to which we may wish to attend if we can accept the idea that the major curriculum focus of the seventies is going to be a highly self-critical reexamination of the quality of life and society in the United States.

The document concludes with a series of eleven commitments drawn from our review of what critics have to say to us. These reflect major points of concern for improvement in the quality of life and society in the United States that seem, to the ASCD Executive Committee, to be legitimate. Each is a proposal of Association commitment to work for such improvement in both society and the schools.

You will find in these proposed commitments a platform of action that undergirds the present Generation of New Understandings (GNU) program along the lines of *relevance* and *accountability.*

The following seven points of critical concern are discussed in detail on pages 64 to 78 of this booklet:

1. IMMEDIACY
2. AUSTERITY
3. AUTHENTICITY
4. OPENNESS
5. AUTONOMY
6. RESPONSIBILITY
7. REVERENCE.

The list of eleven Association commitments begins on page 79.

I. Some Points of Critical Concern

1. Immediacy

	Nay	*Yea*
Concern for the quality of immediate experience	Preparation: for life, future, etc.	Enjoyment of what is available
Honoring now, the present	"Delayed gratification"	Primacy of aesthetic experience
Joy	Work as an end in itself	Maximizing of intimate personal relations, including sex
	"Entertainment" through mass media or spectator events: passive, spare time	Physical functioning: sports, dance, out-of-doors
	Progress: realization of the ideal some time hence	Non-work time, free time: being and reflecting
	Perfectionism, utopianism	Action now, not later

Like most Western societies, ours is future-oriented, at least as far as the controlling forces are concerned. The present is a product of the past; the present is preparation for a future that by definition never comes. For most of us, things as they are are never good enough. Impatient, restless, goal-seeking, we keep one eye on where we have come from and the other on where we are going. No wonder we have trouble focusing on where we are.

Man "creates" time, as Paul Valéry puts it, and "lives but very little in the moment itself. His principal home is in the past or in the future." Is this rejection of concern for the value of the moment "somehow contrary to nature," as Valéry seems to suggest? [1]

The new concern for the quality of immediate experience poses one of the most puzzling challenges to the prevailing American culture. We hardly know what to make of it. Sometimes it sounds like a kind of hedonism that we have thought more characteristic of the rich than of the rest of us. Sometimes it sounds like the heedlessness of the lower classes. We may also see in it reflections from the East . . . the enlargement of the moment, the expansion of human sensibility, timelessness itself.

Perhaps a good deal of the impulse for immediacy originates in an underground recognition that industrial societies like ours have solved the problem of production. We actually do not have to work from sunup to sundown to keep a roof over our heads, food in our mouths. But we are still geared to run our economy on the basis of three shifts a day.

A 32-hour work week is the new goal of organized labor. What for? That may be the question we are already asking ourselves.

[1] Paul Valéry. *The Outlook for Intelligence*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963. p. 97.

2. AUSTERITY

	Nay	*Yea*
Concern for spending time and money on first things	Consumer exploitation in a commercialized society	Public monies devoted to social ends
Investing in what really matters	Over-consumption	Better distribution of income
Essentiality	Salesmanship without conscience	Frugal living
	Exploitation of sex, women	Earning money to live rather than as an end in itself
	Pollution of environment	More money on books, art objects, music
	Education geared at getting a job	Meaningfulness in every aspect of life
		Education as self-development

Production is at an all-time high, unemployment down. We are richer than we have ever been, despite still existing inequities, with more to eat, better housing, more of our youth in college, more easily available and better medical care.

But we are also newly disturbed by questions of priority. We have come to be highly self-critical of where our public monies go. This past year on war and defense we spent $77 billion; on control of pollution the total local, state, and federal expenditure was $47 million. The scramble over the "peace dividend" has already begun. Will it go to jobs for the poor? To the cities? To space exploration? To education?

In another sense, many critics, particularly among the educated young, seem to be saying too that personal priorities need to play a larger part in the investment of time and money. The colleges should return to the task of general education, with a close look at what that needs to be in a modern world; their role in supplying replacements for business and industry and developing know-how on order through subsidized research is under severe attack.

The critics are taking us to task on many minor attributes of the affluent life—over-cleanliness as well as over-consumption, glamorization of women (separating them from the world of competition with men), conventionality and conformity in dress and taste, absence of concern for the truly serious side of life.

This new austerity or essentiality surprises us. We are most of us geared to getting ahead and in full sympathy with rewarding our success by better living conditions, a higher standard of living, as we put it. The idea that there is lack of agreement about what makes up the good life is a little hard to take.

3. AUTHENTICITY

	Nay	*Yea*
Concern for truth, for revelation of facts and feelings	Image building, public relations	Straight reporting of facts
Telling it like it is	Managed news	Absence of glamor
Honesty	Repression of emotional reactions	Expression of feelings, including negative as well as positive
	Reserve in relations with others	Frankness in language and expression of thought
	Good manners	Meaningful dialogue
	"Channels of communication"	Purposeful clarification of conflict in feelings and values
	Truth as factual, final	Congruence between inner and outer worlds
		Enlargement of processes for finding truth

As a people we are aware that the mass media coupled with the concentration of power in the hands of big business and the federal government open our society to attempts to control opinion and determine action. Advertising firms, public relations experts, and public opinion polls have made an art of selling us the product or person we want or ought to want.

We have grown accustomed to the efforts of interested others to try to control our thoughts and behavior as belonging to our kind of society. When we sense a credibility gap, we feel we can handle it. We laugh at the claims of deodorants, dog foods, and enzyme products—but we buy the best known brands. We have got used to a mass culture of half-truths and partial information.

Thus the "Children's Crusade" for Senator McCarthy surprised us. The Chicago demonstrations shocked us. Where did all of these young people come from?

The demand seems to be for a new kind of respect for truth. Honesty may be risky. But its low-keyed rhetoric has to be reckoned with by the old pros.

In the private sector, the passion for authenticity centers on the open expression of feeling. In recalling the standards of good breeding under which he was brought up, Albert Schweitzer spoke of "the claims of the heart" against "the law of reserve":

> Too often we let the opportunity slip by, because the prevailing views about good breeding, politeness, and tact have robbed us of our power of independent action. Then we fail to give to others what we should like to give them, and what they long to have. Our human atmosphere is much colder than it need be, because we do not venture to give ourselves to others as heartily as our feelings bid us.[2]

The open expression of doubt and fears and even animosities is also needed if man is to know others and himself as well. The willingness to express fully what we really think and feel is often the first step to inner or self authenticity as well as to relating authentically with those who seem to differ most from ourselves.

[2] Albert Schweitzer. *Memoirs of Childhood and Youth*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. p. 72.

4. Openness

	Nay	*Yea*
Concern for new possibilities in every area of human existence	The establishment in all its forms:	New family patterns
Valuing the new, the unfamiliar, the untried	political economic educational religious musical dramatic	New church practices
Risk-taking	graphic arts etc.	New art forms
		Community-centered decision making
		Participatory democracy
		Values of contributions from non-Western cultures
		Respect for and protection of the different or divergent
		Inventiveness, innovation

While we value change, we often seem more receptive to changes in the technological realm than in the realm of personal values and social relationships. Or when something new in the realm of the arts takes our imagination, we are likely to exploit it, use it up. Our TV commercials go psychedelic, our new musicals all sound like *Hair*.

Perhaps the mass society tends to the absorption and standardization of what is novel, if that is possible.

A dynamic society prides itself on openness to new proposals and prospects. We can accept a recent characterization of ours as a "temporary" society, committed to "chronic change." [3] We may have more trouble accepting the glorification of youth as "the only group that can perpetually renew [the society's] lack of commitment as its older members are siphoned off into the ranks of the committed." [4] Indeed, the authors propose to redefine a generation as five years rather than 30.

What we seem to be facing is a more conscious acceptance of the fact that while change is inevitable, it needs to be helped along. Attacks on the establishment—all the establishments—thus are understood as part of the process of making sure that power is continuously redistributed or its holders forced into recognition of the claims of the new.

But acceptance comes after the fact. First there must be discovery of the new, invention, creation, reconceptualization, experimentation. The new must be studied and understood, tried out, tested, fitted on. Part of the modern receptivity resides in willingness to consider alternatives, to see good in developing and maintaining options, in valuing options or new possibilities in many aspects of our culture.

[3] Warren G. Bennis and Philip E. Slater. *The Temporary Society*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

5. Autonomy

	Nay	*Yea*
Concern for "universal emancipation" from institutional, social, or political pressures	Over-socialization into prevailing roles and values	Alternatives as essential
Deciding for oneself	Acceptance of authority as fixed, adjusting to it	Open choice-making
Selfhood	The popular culture as commercialized, standardized: TV, best sellers, etc.	Questioning of accepted values and practices
	Status-seeking	Creation of own personally satisfying situations
	Bureaucracy	Communal associations outside institutions of regular society
		Trust in one's own "innards"

Independence of judgment and action has long been regarded by us as fundamental to the proper functioning of our society—a society of free men, as we used to speak of it. Yet the diversity upon which we have depended has dwindled, the critics contend, as we have become both bigger and more closely-knit.

Thus renewed attention is going to the need to maintain a sense of personal autonomy in the face of excessive institutionalization. Sociology, under attack by the Sorbonne rebels as a science subservient to the forces of control, has helped us understand how we are or can be shaped by and for a society at the possible expense of our own sense of self-direction and self-fulfillment.

Dissent has had an honored place in our history. We have come to depend upon reform movements to mobilize us in time to accomplish needed change. A strong element of utopianism in the pre-Civil War years of the 19th century gave us as many as 140 communities, from Brook Farm to Salt Lake City, where new bases for living might be tried out. But for most of us today the re-emphasis on autonomy in a mass society promises a new kind of loneliness. "We die alone and to a certain extent we must live alone, with fidelity to ourselves."[5]

Perhaps our greatest human task is to restore the excitement man can feel as a creative artist. Leonid Andreev expresses this feeling in a letter to Maxim Gorky (1908). From the rejection of life, the novelist says, he has suddenly turned to "the affirmation of it, and while I formerly thought that only death exists, now I am beginning to guess that there is only life." He reports that he has been "feeling almost constantly an immense, monstrous joy in life" and "invincible confidence in the triumph of life." What the source of his joy is he does not know but believes that in time "in the wild variety of impressions I may perceive some majestic unity still unknown to me."[6] Perhaps this is the necessary and ultimate human hope.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

[6] Peter Yershov, editor. *Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899-1912.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. p. 97.

6. Responsibility

	Nay	*Yea*
Concern for living by values that transcend national boundaries, reach out to world	Military service, war, weapon research and development, military expenditures	Dissent and protest against military service and support
Acting in terms of what one knows to be right	Delay in meeting needs of poor, racially victimized, etc.	Dissent and protest against lack of responsiveness to poor
Community	Instances of injustices	Dissent and protest against practices that contravene human values in fields of politics, legislation, courts, international relations
	Capital punishment	
	Lack of personal involvement or commitment	Sense of absolute personal responsibility for one's own behavior, free from majority pressure

In a sense, the new definition of responsibility that is proposed by the counter cultures is really an extension of the exercise of autonomy. However, the context for this exercise becomes the world community.

The Nuremberg trials set forth the principle that each man is accountable before a court of universal justice that transcends loyalties to any lesser tribunal. Man can no longer justify his behavior by the claim that he was following the orders of a superior or that he felt himself powerless in the midst of other compelling circumstances.

What this seems to many to mean is that everyone must read as well as he can what is absolutely just and try as he can to live by his understanding. Faith comes through belief that as each man lives his life righteously, life altogether will become what it ought to be. Community in its truest sense will be born.

Such an outlook is hard for most of us to comprehend. "You want to reform the Church," Kierkegaard wrote in his diary in 1851, "then get first of all one Christian and let him reform the Church." [7] At the end of his long life, as Norman Cousins reports, Schweitzer returned again and again to the sense of helplessness with which modern man confronts the forces of fate, contending that:

> . . . it is a mistake to suppose that great events are not shaped by small energies. If the energies are life-giving, if they come out of the desire to sustain life and ennoble it, they will have an effect on the whole. Therefore, the question is not how he can take hold of the great forces, but rather how he can take hold of his own life and put it to good use.[8]

[7] Sören A. Kierkegaard. *Armed Neutrality and an Open Letter.* Translated and edited by H. V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968. p. 46.

[8] Norman Cousins. "Lambaréné Revisited." *Saturday Review* 52: 28-32; October 4, 1969. p. 29.

7. Reverence

	Nay	*Yea*
Concern for meaning in human experience	Sectarianism	Worship as an act of community
Searching for the significant	Formalism in religious worship	Release rather than restriction
	Self-denial, constriction of the instincts and feelings	Respect for feelings and emotions
	Censoriousness	Eclecticism: drawing on many sources for inspiration
	Fear of death: revulsion and anxiety	Celebration
		Love of life: acceptance and trust

What makes life worth living anyway? The search for answers to man's eternal question—the quest for the sacred—is being pursued in many directions today, with a sense of urgency that may sometimes seem almost desperate.

All of us are aware, of course, that there is reason for the new urgency. Man stands in his own cross-sights, so to speak. Even the talks begun at Helsinki will seek to stabilize second-strike capability at 20 or 30 or perhaps 40 percent. In the past, man as an individual has always opted for life over death. But now the option is open to man as a species. For all or most of mankind, the answer to the question "What makes life worth living?" could be "Nothing."

Perhaps this prospect is more than we can face up to; self-annihilation is simply unthinkable. In technological societies, we have reached a point at which pestilence and famine and to some extent even death, the natural enemies of man, are under our control. Only war, the scourge that man himself creates, remains. We seem to have a kind of faith that we can survive until that too comes under our control.

Thus the desperation of the contemporary search for significance may be perceived as a necessary and essentially human effort to reassure ourselves that life is worth the living, even though the diversity and diffuseness of the search may still perplex us. The religions of the East and Near East are being newly studied for what they may offer. The nature of ecstasy is being analyzed in terms that range very far afield from the experience of most of us. The role of chance and the blind forces of fate is newly in the picture, even if only half seriously. The function of our genetic heritage in determining our behavior and ends has again come under serious study.

The search or quest for the sacred would seem to have affected even those of us deep within the established way of life. The movement toward lay participation in church governance and conduct of church rituals, the support of the emergence of the church into the mainstream of social revitalization, the progress of the ecumenical idea—all may be held to be symptomatic of discomfort with things as they have been.

Possibly what we are undergoing is the result of trying to put together and reconcile in some ways the virtues or values of an emerging new culture, that will make more room for immediacy, austerity, authenticity, openness, autonomy, and responsibility. What a task this proposes for man!

The myths of mankind speak to us today as in the past. Prometheus, the Titan who stood between man and the gods, would seem now to embody the assumption by man of ever greater accountability for what he has been able to make of himself and his world. A century and a half ago in *Prometheus Unbound* the poet Shelley celebrated the moment of human triumph at which man would cast his lot against the tyranny of what may be called fate or fortune:

> Love, from its awful throne of patient power
> In the wise heart, from the last giddy hour
> Of dead endurance, from the slippery, steep,
> And narrow verge of crag-like agony, springs
> And folds over the world its healing wings.

Thus unbound by love and possessed by reverence for life, man might at last be able to set himself free to create in the world whatever he found to be good:

> . . . to hope till Hope creates
> From its own wreck the thing it contemplates;
> Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent;
> This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be
> Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free;
> This is alone Life, Joy, Empire, and Victory.[9]

[9] Percy Bysshe Shelley. *Prometheus Unbound*. Act IV. In: *Complete Works of Shelley*. R. Ingpen and W. E. Peck, editors. New York: Gordian Press, Inc., 1965.

II. New or Renewed Commitments

Commitment One

The prime mover of man is the quest for meaning in life beyond the satisfaction of material wants.

All of us in our society and in our schools must attend directly to the need of man for finding life meaningful. We must examine and question the quality of life in our industrial and technological society as it forwards man's search for or creation of significance beyond the satisfaction of basic human wants.

We are agreed that we will ally ourselves with those who would maximize the arrangements and relationships in society that may contribute to a more meaningful life for all its members. We pledge that in the schools we will educate ourselves, students and teachers alike, to engage as rewardingly as possible in the pursuit of significance and the making of a way of life that is truly meaningful.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools for the realization of meaning and significance in all human undertakings.

Commitment Two

The community to which each of us must hold himself ultimately responsible is the community of world opinion and universal law.

All of us, as members of our society and profession, understand and accept the expansion of the arena in which there now exists personal responsibility for the consequences of individual behavior. We agree to be vigilant in reviewing the conditions and practices in our society as these provide freedom, equality, and justice for us all.

If or when we find less than optimum conditions, we agree to ally ourselves with those who would alter and improve our social arrangements for the fuller realization of freedom, equality, and justice. Also, in our schools we pledge ourselves to educate for the exercise of personal responsibility for realizing the basic values that we hope will imbue our national life and that we know transcend national boundaries.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools for the realization of freedom, equality, and justice.

Commitment Three

An elementary and essential criterion for evaluation of any society is the feeling of being fully alive within it.

All of us are agreed that the sense of being able to live deeply each moment of experience is integral to human fulfillment. We must remain alert to those arrangements and relationships that forward enjoyment of life and those that do not.

We agree to ally ourselves in support of conditions that maximize human fulfillment in our society and in opposition to those that hamper it. In the schools, we pledge our energies to the development of an environment and an education that nourish and expand the powers of human fulfillment.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools for an increase in human responsiveness and personal fulfillment.

Commitment Four

Individuality in behavior and belief is not only a basic human right but the major resource of any dynamic society.

All of us are agreed that within a framework of concern for the common good the individual has the right to develop and live by his own sense of values; we understand, too, that to remain dynamic a society requires contributions from persons who have learned to view the world and its problems and prospects in new and unfamiliar ways. In the face of the pressures for conformity and standardization in a mass society, we agree that we need to be highly alert to conditions that sustain or interfere with the development of individuality.

When we find unacceptable conditions in our society, we agree to ally ourselves with those who would alter and improve them. We pledge ourselves to the development in the schools of a curriculum that sustains and enhances individuality.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools to support individuality of behavior and belief.

Commitment Five

Authenticity in the expression of feelings is essential to both personal well-being and social health.

We all acknowledge the right and need of the individual to express himself freely; we understand and value the open expression and exchange of feelings as fundamental to full personal development and also to effective social interaction. We are agreed that one criterion we must apply to the arrangements and relationships of our society is provision for the authentic expression of feelings.

As we find need to alter situations to forward authenticity of expression, we agree to ally ourselves with those who would help in the alteration. We pledge ourselves to create in the schools content and conditions that honor the need for and make use of honesty in the expression of feelings.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools for authenticity in the expression of feelings.

Commitment Six

Access to and participation in the arts are an essential human heritage on which the quality of life in any society in large part depends.

We are agreed on the contribution to the quality of human living that can be made only by the arts. We agree that we must be active in assessing the extent to which the arts are integral to the lives of everyone in our society.

As we can, we agree to ally ourselves with efforts to enlarge attention to and support of the arts. In the schools, we pledge ourselves to make access to and participation in the arts as central a curriculum concern as any other, within a context that values the new as well as the old, honors the ethnic contributions of peoples from many lands, and incorporates a high regard for excellence in the creation of art products as well as in appreciation and performance.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools for full access to and participation in the arts.

Commitment Seven

The processes by which society tends to renew rather than merely maintain itself have to be understood and properly managed if a society is to remain dynamic.

We all understand that the processes of socialization, neces-

sary as they are, tend to reproduce rather than reconstruct a society. We agree that we must be vigilant in assessing the extent to which these processes are managed in our society so that the best elements are maintained but our faults and failures are laid open to replacement.

We agree to ally ourselves with those forces in society working for needed renewal. In the schools, we pledge ourselves to the development of a curriculum that educates for social criticism and action toward correction of our faults and failures.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools for effective social renewal.

Commitment Eight

The allocation of its resources to meet basic human needs characterizes the good society.

All of us are agreed that in our society first things must come first—the eradication or reduction of poverty, full employment without regard to ethnic or racial origin, provision of adequate medical care, equal educational opportunities, provision of decent housing, renewal of the inner city and the rural slum, the control of environmental pollution, maintenance of ecological balance, and conservation of natural resources. We know that we must remain vigilant to make sure that our economic resources are devoted to such ends.

We agree to support those who work in these directions and to try to persuade those who hesitate to do so. We pledge ourselves to develop a curriculum in the schools that identifies major economic and other national problems and educates for political action on them.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools for the full use of common resources to satisfy primary human needs.

Commitment Nine

Women remain the largest and most neglected resource in our society, both under-educated and under-employed.

We are agreed that women have the right to the same opportunities for development as men in all the realms of human activity, including education, work, and participation in public life. Recognizing the discrimination, exploitation, and repression suffered by

women, we agree that we must keep the changing status of women in our society under continuous close assessment.

We agree to support conditions in our society that promote the equal development of women and oppose those that do not. In the schools, we pledge ourselves to develop a curriculum that assists in redefining or enlarging roles for women and also provides a broader base of vocational and professional options.

This Association commits itself to working in society and the schools for the greater self-fulfillment of women.

Commitment Ten

The communication of reliable information is crucial in a society served by mass media.

We are of course agreed that the truth, as well as we can arrive at it, is basic to the building of understandings in every aspect of our lives. Thus, we agree to the need for continuous assessment of how well the channels by which information and ideas are disseminated in our society do function.

We agree that in cases where we find abuse, we will ally ourselves with those who would correct it; we recognize the need for such alertness and alliance arises in part because of the centralized and commercialized control of television and the consolidation of ownership of local newspapers. We pledge ourselves also to the education of the young in the critical consumption of the messages of the mass media and to problems of their public regulation and counterbalance.

This Association commits itself to working in both society and the schools to assure honesty of public communications.

Commitment Eleven

Peace comes at home and abroad from the constructive management of conflict.

We are agreed that violence and war are intolerable ways of trying to resolve conflict—and that no problem of man is greater than finding creative and constructive ways of handling or managing conflict when it arises, as it must, to help us see points of domestic and international discord in need of reconciliation. We know, too, that trying to smooth over conflict is no more effective in the long run than ignoring it; what is needed are ways of re-

solving tension that lead to new levels of common purpose. We agree that we must be alert to conditions in our society that support creative conflict management or that work against it.

We agree to support and to further conditions that lead to constructive conflict management and to ally ourselves with others who would remove or alter conditions that do not. We pledge ourselves to develop an educational program in the schools that will teach the nature and function of domestic and international conflict, the history and failure of violence and war as solutions to conflict, and the elements, procedures, and problems of constructive conflict management.

This Association commits itself to working for peace in both society and the schools.

Contributors

ALEXANDER FRAZIER
Professor of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, and President, ASCD, 1969-70

JOHN D. GREENE
Director of Instruction, Baton Rouge Public Schools, Louisiana, and President, ASCD, 1970-71

SAMUEL D. PROCTOR
Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

THEODORE ROSZAK
Professor of History, California State College, Hayward

ASCD Publications

(The NEA stock number appears in parentheses after each title.)

Yearbooks

Balance in the Curriculum (610-17274)	$4.00
Evaluation as Feedback and Guide (610-17700)	$6.50
Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools (610-17256)	$3.00
Guidance in the Curriculum (610-17266)	$3.75
Individualizing Instruction (610-17264)	$4.00
Leadership for Improving Instruction (610-17454)	$3.75
Learning and Mental Health in the School (610-17674)	$5.00
Learning and the Teacher (610-17270)	$3.75
Life Skills in School and Society (610-17786)	$5.50
New Insights and the Curriculum (610-17548)	$5.00
Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education (610-17278)	$4.50
Research for Curriculum Improvement (610-17268)	$4.00
Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director (610-17624)	$4.50
To Nurture Humaneness: Commitment for the '70's (610-17810)	$5.75
Youth Education: Problems, Perspectives, Promises (610-17746)	$5.50

Booklets

Better Than Rating (611-17298)	$1.25
The Changing Curriculum: Mathematics (611-17724)	$2.00
The Changing Curriculum: Modern Foreign Languages (611-17714)	$2.00
The Changing Curriculum: Science (611-17704)	$1.50
Changing Supervision for Changing Times (611-17802)	$2.00
Children's Social Learning (611-17326)	$1.75
Cooperative International Education (611-17344)	$1.50
Criteria for Theories of Instruction (611-17736)	$2.00
Curriculum Change: Direction and Process (611-17698)	$2.00
Curriculum Decisions ←→ Social Realities (611-17770)	$2.75
A Curriculum for Children (611-17790)	$2.75
Curriculum Materials 1970 (611-17882)	$2.00
Discipline for Today's Children and Youth (611-17314)	$1.00
Early Childhood Education Today (611-17766)	$2.00
Educating the Children of the Poor (611-17762)	$2.00
Elementary School Mathematics: A Guide to Current Research (611-17752)	$2.75
Elementary School Science: A Guide to Current Research (611-17726)	$2.25
Elementary School Social Studies: A Guide to Current Research (611-17384)	$2.75
The Elementary School We Need (611-17636)	$1.25
Ethnic Modification of the Curriculum (611-17832)	$1.00
Freeing Capacity To Learn (611-17322)	$1.00
Guidelines for Elementary Social Studies (611-17738)	$1.50
The High School We Need (611-17312)	$ .50
Human Variability and Learning (611-17332)	$1.50
The Humanities and the Curriculum (611-17708)	$2.00
Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process (611-17722)	$2.25
Humanizing the Secondary School (611-17780)	$2.75
Hunters Point Redeveloped (611-17348)	$2.00
Improving Educational Assessment & An Inventory of Measures of Affective Behavior (611-17804)	$3.00
Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research (611-17560)	$2.75
Influences in Curriculum Change (611-17730)	$2.25
Intellectual Development: Another Look (611-17618)	$1.75
The International Dimension of Education (611-17816)	$2.25
The Junior High School We Need (611-17338)	$1.00
The Junior High School We Saw (611-17604)	$1.50
Language and Meaning (611-17696)	$2.75
Learning More About Learning (611-17310)	$1.00
Linguistics and the Classroom Teacher (611-17720)	$2.75
A Man for Tomorrow's World (611-17838)	$2.25
New Curriculum Developments (611-17664)	$1.75
New Dimensions in Learning (611-17336)	$1.50
The New Elementary School (611-17734)	$2.50
Nurturing Individual Potential (611-17606)	$1.50
Personalized Supervision (611-17680)	$1.75
Strategy for Curriculum Change (611-17666)	$1.25
Student Unrest: Threat or Promise? (611-17818)	$2.75
Supervision in Action (611-17346)	$1.25
Supervision: Emerging Profession (611-17796)	$5.00
Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions (611-17732)	$2.00
The Supervisor: Agent for Change in Teaching (611-17702)	$3.25
The Supervisor: New Demands, New Dimensions (611-17782)	$2.50
The Supervisor's Role in Negotiation (611-17798)	$ .75
Theories of Instruction (611-17668)	$2.00
Toward Professional Maturity (611-17740)	$1.50
The Unstudied Curriculum: Its Impact on Children (611-17920)	$2.75
What Are the Sources of the Curriculum? (611-17522)	$1.50
Child Growth Chart (618-17442)	$ .25

Discounts on quantity orders of same title to single address: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10 or more copies, 20%. All orders must be prepaid except for those on official purchase order forms. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. **The NEA stock number of each publication must be listed when ordering.**

Subscription to **Educational Leadership**—$6.50 a year. ASCD Membership dues: regular (subscription and yearbook)—$20.00 a year; Comprehensive (includes subscription and yearbook plus other publications issued during period of the membership)—$30.00 a year.

Order from: **Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA**
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036